UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
NATIONAL MARINE FISHERIES SERVICE
Southwest Region
501 West Ocean Boulevard, Suite 4200
Long Beach, California 90802- 4213

JAN 24 2005

In Reply Refer To:
151422SWR01SA5817:HLB

Donna E. Tegleman
Regional Resources Planner
United States Bureau of Reclamation
2800 Cottage Way
Sacramento, California 95825

Dear Ms. Tegleman:

This document transmits the National Marine Fisheries Service's (NOAA Fisheries) biological and conference opinion (Enclosure 1) based on our review of the proposed Sutter Mutual Water Company Tisdale Pumping Plant Positive Barrier Fish Screen Project (Tisdale Fish Screen Project), in Sutter County, California, and its effects on federally-listed endangered Sacramento River winter-run Chinook salmon (*Oncorhynchus tshawytscha*), threatened Central Valley spring-run Chinook salmon (*O. tshawytscha*), threatened Central Valley steelhead (*O. mykiss*), the designated critical habitat of Sacramento River winter-run Chinook salmon, and proposed critical habitat for Central Valley spring-run Chinook salmon and Central Valley steelhead in accordance with section 7 of the Endangered Species Act (ESA) of 1973, as amended (16 U.S.C. 1531 *et seq.*). Your request for formal consultation was received on July 26, 2004.

This biological and conference opinion is based on information provided in the July 2004, Action Specific Implementation Plan (ASIP), and discussions held at meetings with representatives of NOAA Fisheries, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS), the California Department of Fish and Game (DFG), the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation), and the Sutter Mutual Water Company. A complete administrative record of this consultation is on file at the NOAA Fisheries Sacramento Field Office.

Based on the best available scientific and commercial information, the biological and conference opinion concludes that this project is not likely to jeopardize the listed species or adversely modify designated or proposed critical habitat. NOAA Fisheries also has included an incidental take statement with reasonable and prudent measures and non-discretionary terms and conditions that are necessary and appropriate to minimize incidental take associated with the Tisdale Fish Screen Project. The conference opinion concerning proposed critical habitat does not take the place of consultation under section 7(a)2 of the ESA. The conference opinion may be adopted as a biological opinion when the proposed critical habitat designations for Central Valley spring-run Chinook salmon and Central Valley steelhead become final if no significant new information is developed, and no significant changes to the project are made that would alter the contents of this opinion.

Also enclosed are Essential Fish Habitat (EFH) Conservation Recommendations for Pacific salmon as required by the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (MSA) as amended (16 U.S.C. 1801 *et seq.*; Enclosure 2). This document concludes that the Tisdale Fish Screen Project will adversely affect the EFH of Pacific Salmon in the action area and adopts certain of the terms and conditions of the incidental take statement and the ESA Conservation Recommendations of the biological and conference opinion as the EFH Conservation Recommendations.

Section 305(b)4(B) of the MSA requires Reclamation to provide NOAA Fisheries with a detailed written response within 30 days, and 10 days in advance of any action, to the EFH conservation recommendations, including a description of measures adopted by Reclamation for avoiding, minimizing, or mitigating the impact of the project on EFH (50 CFR §600.920[j]). In the case of a response that is inconsistent with our recommendations, Reclamation must explain its reasons for not following the recommendations, including the scientific justification for any disagreements with NOAA Fisheries over the anticipated effects of the proposed action and the measures needed to avoid, minimize, or mitigate such effects.

If you have any questions regarding this correspondence please contact Mr. Howard Brown in our Sacramento Area Office, 650 Capitol Mall, Suite 8-300, Sacramento, California 95814. Mr. Brown may be reached by telephone at (916) 930-3608 or by Fax at (916) 930-3629.

Sincerely,

Rodney R McInnis

Rodney R. McInnis
Regional Administrator

Enclosures (2)

cc: NOAA Fisheries-PRD, Long Beach, California
Steve Thomas, NOAA Fisheries, Santa Rosa, California
William O'Leary, FWS, 2800 Cottage Way, Sacramento, California, 95825
Max Sakato, Sutter Mutual Water Company, PO Box 128, Robbins, California, 95676
Wendy Bogdin, Downey Brand LLP, 444 Capitol Mall, 10th floor, Sacramento, California, 95814

Enclosure 1

BIOLOGICAL AND CONFERENCE OPINION

ACTION AGENCY:	United States Bureau of Reclamation Mid-Pacific Region
ACTIVITY:	Sutter Mutual Water Company Tisdale Pumping Plant Positive Barrier Fish Screen Project
CONSULTATION CONDUCTED BY:	Southwest Region, National Marine Fisheries Service
DATE ISSUED:	JAN 24 2005

I. CONSULTATION HISTORY

The Sutter Mutual Water Company Tisdale Pumping Plant Positive Barrier Fish Screen Project (Tisdale Fish Screen Project) was developed over the course of several years at meetings of the Anadromous Fish Screen Program (AFSP) Technical Team. The Sutter Mutual Water Company, CH2M Hill, and Hanson Environmental, Inc. developed the project design with technical input from the AFSP.

In December 2003, Cathy Bailey, of the Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation) provided an electronic copy of the Draft Biological Assessment (BA) for the Sutter Mutual Water Company Tisdale Pumping Plant Positive Barrier Fish Screen Project to National Marine Fisheries Service (NOAA Fisheries) biologist Howard Brown. On December 22, 2003, NOAA Fisheries biologist Howard Brown provided comments to Cathy Bailey at Reclamation on the draft BA.

In January 2004, Mary Grim of Reclamation provided NOAA Fisheries biologist Howard Brown with an electronic copy of the Revised Draft of the Biological Assessment/Action Specific Implementation Plan (BA/ASIP) for the Tisdale Fish Screen Project. On February 24, 2004, NOAA Fisheries biologist Howard Brown provided comments to Mary Grim at Reclamation on the draft BA/ASIP.

On May 24, 2004, Reclamation held a meeting with NOAA Fisheries, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS), the California Department of Fish and Game (DFG), and the Sutter Mutual Water Company to discuss ASIP requirements and section 7 consultation timeframes.

On June 28, 2004, Reclamation requested formal consultation with NOAA Fisheries for the Tisdale Fish Screen Project, in Sutter County, California. The request for consultation included the Final ASIP for the proposed action.

This biological and conference opinion is based on information provided in the ASIP, discussions held at AFSP Technical Team meetings, and discussions between Howard Brown of NOAA Fisheries, Chuck Hanson of Hanson Environmental, Inc., Paul Ward of DFG, and Mary Grim of Reclamation. A complete administrative record of this consultation is on file at the NOAA Fisheries Sacramento Field Office.

II. DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSED ACTION

Reclamation and the Sutter Mutual Water Company propose to fund, construct and operate the Tisdale Fish Screen Project along the east bank of the Sacramento River, near river mile (RM) 118. Reclamation will provide partial funding through the Central Valley Project Improvement Act (CVPIA) Anadromous Fish Restoration Program's (AFRP), and the CALFED Bay-Delta Program. The Sutter Mutual Water Company will construct the fish screen and associated facilities. The proposed action will involve the construction of an approximately 280-foot long by 50-foot high positive-barrier fish screen at an existing water diversion. The screen will be comprised of 16 panels, each with 182 square feet of surface area. The total effective fish screen area will be 2,909 square feet to maintain an existing pumping capacity of 960 cfs while meeting NOAA Fisheries and DFG anadromous fish screening criteria at all projected river elevations. The proposed action includes construction activities, operations and maintenance, conservation measures, and monitoring.

A. Construction Activities

Construction activities will include 1) site preparation and civil work, 2) installation of cofferdams and the concrete fish screen structure, 3) installation of the fish screen panels and brush cleaner, 4) installation of other associated project features, and 5) removal of cofferdams and construction equipment.

1. <u>Construction Schedule</u>

Construction is scheduled to begin between May and July 2005, and continue for approximately 24 months. Site preparation and installation of the cofferdam will begin between May and July 2005, depending on Sacramento River flows. Cofferdam installation will take approximately 60 to 90 days. Once cofferdams are in place, construction will continue through project completion. Following installation of the fish screen and associated facility features, cofferdams will be cut off at the base of the fish screen structure, construction equipment will be removed, and the site will be stabilized.

2. <u>Initial Site Preparation and Civil Work</u>

Site preparation consists of dredging and excavating within the Sacramento River and within the Tisdale Pumping Plant forebay, and construction of gravel access roads along both the north and south sides of the facility. Dredging within the Sacramento River and intake forebay is required to create a proper foundation for the fish screen structure and adequate channel capacity and hydraulic control within the forebay for velocity regulation.

Dredging within the Sacramento River will be performed from a barge or shore-mounted crane. The majority of excavation for the screen foundation will occur within the confines of a cofferdam installed to provide dry conditions for construction of the fish screen facility. A combination of hydraulic and clamshell dredging in wet conditions may be necessary for coffer dam site preparation.

Excavation of the existing Tisdale intake forebay will be performed to enhance the uniformity of velocities across the fish screen structure and to reduce erosion of bank material into the intake forebay during flood events. Excavation and dredging within the forebay will occur as part of site preparation, with the additional installation of sheet pile retaining walls on both the north and south sides of the forebay to further facilitate intake maintenance and hydraulic control. The dredging of the forebay will occur behind a cofferdam in the dry.

Site surveys were performed to compile information on bathymetric conditions within the Sacramento River and intake forebay, and topographic contours adjacent to the existing facilities. Based on these preliminary bathymetric and topographic measurements, it is estimated that the volume of sediment to be dredged from the Sacramento River is approximately 300 cubic yards. Approximately 4,700 cubic yards of sediment will be dredged and excavated from the intake forebay and cofferdam area. Dredge material may be used on-site depending on its quality, in part, as fill material in preparing the north and south access roads to the fish screen structure. The total estimated volume of fill for the north and south access areas is estimated to be 8,000 cubic yards. Earthen backfill, crushed rock and asphalt to be used for access roads will be imported from off-site.

Access roads will be constructed on both the north and south sides of the existing intake forebay to allow equipment access to the fish screen structure during construction and for routine operations and maintenance. Approach roads to the fish screen construction area will consist of clean concrete and earthen backfill contained within the sheet pile retaining walls.

3. Construction of Cofferdam and Fish Screen Structure

Construction of the fish screen structure will involve placing cofferdams, dewatering the project area, and installing the concrete foundation. During the construction period, operation of the Tisdale Pumping Plant will continue to meet water delivery demands within the service area by pumping water through the cofferdam, or installing the cofferdam and constructing the fish screen in two stages.

Cofferdam construction will involve the use of sheet piles and steel beams. Sheet piling will be installed from a barge and/or on-shore crane after initial dredging and site preparation. The cofferdam sheet pile will be installed using a vibrating hammer. Use of a pile driving hammer may be required during sheet pile installation if substrate conditions do not allow successful use of the vibrating hammer. Use of the percussion hammer will be minimized to the maximum extent possible to install either piling supports and/or sheet piling. The sheet piles will be interlocking sections, partially buried into the river bottom substrate, and extending upward from the river bed to a river stage elevation of approximately 50 feet. The cofferdam then will be dewatered, using portable pumps. The cofferdam will enclose an area of approximately 0.5 acres.

Once cofferdams are installed, dredging and site preparation will be completed and construction of the fish screen structure will begin. The fish screen structure will be composed of reinforced concrete and will be installed under dry conditions behind the cofferdams.

To maintain water supplies during the construction period, one of two cofferdam installation methods will be used: a rotating dual cofferdam, or a single cofferdam. A dual cofferdam option will involve phased construction of two cofferdams, the first of which will obstruct approximately 60 percent of the open area of the Tisdale intake forebay. After the initial phase when 60 percent of the fish screen structure is completed, the cofferdam will be removed and a new cofferdam will be constructed to allow construction of the remaining 40 percent of the fish screen structure.

A single cofferdam option will involve the installation of a single cofferdam across the Tisdale forebay. Large diameter pipes, providing an open area of approximately 40 percent, will pass through the cofferdam to provide water to meet operational demands during construction of the positive-barrier screen.

Although they differ in some ways, the two approaches to cofferdam construction are functionally equivalent in terms of: 1) the area open for water diversion during construction, 2) net increase in approach velocity during the construction period, 3) construction period (with the exception of the dual cofferdam approach requiring two separate installation events), 4) amount of suspended sediment delivered to the Sacramento River during construction, and 5) dredging and site preparation.

4. <u>Installation of Fish Screen Panels, Cleaning Device, and Associated Project Features</u>

A total of 16 screen panels, each with an effective width of 14.9 feet and an effective height of 12.2 feet, will be installed within the concrete fish screen structure. Fish screen panels will consist of stainless steel vertical wedge wire with 1.75 millimeter (mm) slot openings. Screen panels will be installed using a mobile crane. Each screen panel will be removable to allow for annual pressure washing, cleaning and maintenance, as well as inspection of screen integrity.

Once the fish screen panels are installed, a mechanical brush cleaning system will be installed along the screen face. Associated features, including motor-controlled intake gates, a floating log boom, a sediment jetting system, and rock riprap also will be installed.

The existing cast iron slide gates will be replaced with motor-controlled gates and a computer-controlled head differential monitoring system. The motor-control gate system will be used to maintain the operational performance and function of the fish screen structure. A floating log boom will be installed along the screen face to deflect floating debris, and prevent material from being impinged on the screen, damaging screen panels, or damaging the traveling brush cleaner.

The levee within the project area is currently protected from erosion by riprap. The proposed project will add to existing riprap along the levee and fish screen foundation. Riprap will be placed along the foundation of fish screen structure and along the levee, immediately adjacent to the upstream and downstream ends of the facility. The riprap will maintain designed hydraulic function along the screen face to meet fish screen performance criteria, and protect the fish screen foundation from scour and erosion. Riprap material used as part of the proposed project will be similar to that currently existing at the Tisdale Pumping Plant site, as well as along levees throughout the Sacramento River system, and typically will consist of natural rock ranging from 2 feet to 4 feet in diameter.

B. Operation and Maintenance

The fish screen is designed to operate at the existing maximum diversion rate of 960 cfs from March through December. Operation and maintenance activities will be performed to maintain function of the fish screen and the pumping facility. The fish screen will be operated and maintained to reduce debris and sediment accumulation that will adversely affect the magnitude and uniformity of approach velocities by creating turbulence in front of the screen.

The mechanical cleaning brush will be operated to remove accumulated debris from the screen surface and help insure that the fish screen operates in accordance with the approach velocity design criteria. The mechanical cleaning brush will be operational throughout the period of diversion operations. The cycle time for the brush cleaning system will be less than five minutes. In addition to the screen cleaning brush, individual screen panels will be removed annually or at other necessary intervals for inspection and removal of debris. A portable, high-pressure wash water system will be used to facilitate screen panel cleaning. A sediment jetting system installed in the fish screen bay also will reduce sediment deposition and accumulation within the fish screen. The sediment jetting system will include a series of pipes located on the bottom of the intake forebay, each having a series of nozzles that will be designed to cause turbulence and resuspend sediments deposited within the forebay which could then be removed by Tisdale Pumping Plant diversion pumps and transported to the distribution canals, thereby reducing the need for maintenance dredging within the forebay as part of fish screen maintenance.

Intake maintenance will be facilitated by a boom truck or mobile crane, to remove individual screen panels for cleaning, maintenance, and repair as needed. Prior to each irrigation season, screen panels will be removed for inspection, repair, and high-pressure washing. Backup panels will be available on-site to replace screen panels that require maintenance or repair. Periodic maintenance dredging will be performed as part of this project to remove accumulated sediments. Dredging will occur behind the screen within the intake forebay and should not occur within the Sacramento River along the base of the fish screen foundation. A long arm excavator will be used to remove sediment deposited in the forebay. The forebay will be dredged once or twice per year as part of the positive-barrier fish screening maintenance program.

C. Proposed Conservation Measures

Conservation measures incorporated into the project design to avoid or minimize impacts to listed species include:

1. Turbidity Control During Construction

The project will comply with State and Federal water quality control standards throughout the construction period. Turbidity measurements will be taken two times per day during the construction period to maintain compliance with Regional Water Quality Control Board (Regional Board) requirements. To the extent feasible, Sutter Mutual will operate diversion pumps during dredging, and other turbid periods to reduce project-related turbidity and suspended sediments in the Sacramento River.

Additionally, the project has integrated the following conservation measures for dredging and spoil disposal as described in Appendix A, Fisheries Management Plan for Essential Fish Habitat for Pacific Salmon:

- Use collaborative approaches to promote the use of best management practices (BMPs) to control sediment input.
- Monitor dredging activities and report the effects on salmon habitat.
- Employ best engineering practices and management practices to minimize water-column discharges.
- Avoid dredging during juvenile outmigration.
- Consider upland disposal as an alternative to open water disposal.

2. Erosion Control Plan and Stormwater Pollution and Prevention Plan

A soil erosion control plan will be prepared by the contractor prior to grading and excavation activities to minimize potential effects of silt entering the river and increasing river turbidity. The project specifications require that the construction contractor prepare an erosion control plan and a stormwater pollution prevention plan. The construction contractor for the proposed project, using the services of a certified erosion control specialist or California-registered civil engineer, will prepare the plan. The plan will be prepared and implemented before the construction phase begins. DFG, Regional Board staff, and the Sutter Mutual Water Company engineer will review the plan to verify that BMPs have been incorporated to reduce erosion and sedimentation to the maximum extent possible and ensure compliance with this measure. The plan will include, but will not be limited to, the following measures to minimize erosion and sedimentation:

- Use of sedimentation basins and straw bales or other measures to trap sediment and prevent sediment and silt loads from entering the Sacramento River during construction.
- Covering graded areas adjacent to the levee with protective material, such as mulch, and re-seeding with adapted native plant species after construction is complete.
- Incorporating retaining walls into the project design on both the north and south sides of the intake forebay to minimize erosion of soils into the Sacramento River.
- Minimizing surface disturbance of soil and vegetation.
- Placing stockpiled soil where it will not be subject to accelerated erosion.

3. Water Quality Management

Conservation and avoidance measures will be implemented in accordance with the Regional Board requirements. Water quality surveys will be conducted during dredging operations and installation/removal of the cofferdam to ensure that turbidity levels do not increase in surface waters as described. The project field manager will be responsible for monitoring in accordance with established protocols and survey procedures. In the event that turbidity levels increase, Sutter Mutual will notify the Regional Board, DFG, and NOAA Fisheries immediately. Applicable conservation measures are briefly discussed below.

- The discharge of petroleum products or other excavated materials to surface waters is prohibited.

- Activities will not cause turbidity increases in surface waters to exceed the following levels:

  Where natural turbidity is between 0 and 5 Nephelometric Turbidity Units (NTUs), increases will not exceed 1 NTU. Where natural turbidity is between 5 and 50 NTUs, increases will not exceed 20 percent. Where natural turbidity is between 50 and 100 NTUs, increase will not exceed 10 NTUs. Where natural turbidity is greater than 100 NTUs, increases will not exceed 10 percent. These limits will be eased during in-water working periods to allow a turbidity increase of 15 NTUs over background turbidity as measured in surface waters 300 feet downstream from the working area.

- In the event that project activities result in creation of a visible plume in surface waters, the project manager will initiate monitoring of turbidity levels at the discharge site and 300 feet downstream, taking grab samples for analysis of NTU levels twice per day during the work period while the visible plume persists.

- Activities will not cause settleable matter to exceed 0.1 ml/l in surface waters as measured in surface waters 300 feet downstream from the project.

- Activities will not cause visible oil, grease, or foam in the work area or downstream.

- All areas disturbed by project activities will be protected from washout or erosion.

- The Sutter Mutual Water Company will notify the Regional Board, DFG, and NOAA Fisheries immediately if the above criteria for turbidity, oil/grease, or foam are exceeded.

- The Sutter Mutual Water Company will notify the Regional Board, DFG, and NOAA Fisheries immediately of any spill of petroleum products or other organic or earthen materials.

4. Hazardous Materials Control and Spill Prevention and Response Plan

The construction contractor will be required to prepare and implement a hazardous materials control and spill prevention and response plan. The plan will be prepared by the construction contractor for the proposed project and should be implemented before the construction phase begins. The Regional Board, DFG, NOAA Fisheries, and the FWS will review the plan to verify that hazardous material control and spill response measures have been incorporated to control the use of hazardous materials and reduce the chance of spills to the maximum extent practicable. The Regional Board, DFG, NOAA Fisheries, the FWS and the Sutter Mutual engineer will inspect construction activities to ensure compliance with this measure. Measures will include, but will not be limited to, the following:

- Preventing raw cement, concrete or concrete washings, asphalt, paint, or other coating material, oil or other petroleum products, or any other substances that could be hazardous to aquatic life from contaminating the soil or entering watercourses, including ditches and canals.

- Establishing a spill prevention and countermeasure plan before project construction that includes strict on-site handling rules to keep construction and maintenance materials out of drainage and waterways.

- Cleaning up all spills immediately according to the spill prevention and countermeasure plan, and notifying DFG and the Regional Board immediately of spills and cleanup procedures.

- Providing staging and storage areas for equipment, materials, fuels, lubricants, solvents, and other possible contaminants away from watercourses and their watersheds.

5. Fish Rescue Program

A fish rescue will be conducted during the dewatering of the area behind the cofferdam. Portable pumps will be used to dewater the cofferdam area. Water depths will be reduced to a depth of approximately two feet and a team of four fishery biologists and/or field technicians will capture fish using an backpack electrofisher, a 1/4-inch seine, and hand-held dip nets. Captured fish will be relocated to suitable habitat within the Sacramento River, downstream from the project area. A fishery biologist will be present during the construction and dewatering activities to oversee the rescue program. NOAA Fisheries will be notified a minimum of 48 hours in advance of the fish rescue and relocation.

6. Long-term Monitoring and Maintenance Plan

To ensure that the fish screen operates as intended and incidental mortality associated with diversions at the facility are in conformance with the goals and objectives of the project, long-term monitoring and maintenance of the fish screen will be conducted. Monitoring will include approach velocity measurements immediately after initiation of the positive-barrier screen operations, with fine-tuning of velocity control baffles as necessary, to achieve uniformity of velocities in conformance with the DFG and NOAA Fisheries criteria (0.33 ft/sec). Sutter Mutual also will monitor the condition of the positive-barrier screen on an annual basis, and will do periodic visual inspections to remove accumulated debris and repair screen panels as necessary. NOAA Fisheries and DFG will have access to the positive-barrier screen for underwater inspections following completion of intake screen construction. The standards for success will be long-term reliable operation of the fish screen, and conformance with intake screen design criteria.

D. Action Area

The action area is defined as all areas to be affected directly or indirectly by the Federal action and not merely the immediate area involved in the action (50 CFR §402.02). The action area, for the purposes of this biological and conference opinion, is located in the Sacramento River near RM 118, and extends approximately 600 meters upstream and 600 meters downstream of the Tisdale Pumping Plant Forebay. This area was selected because it represents the upstream and downstream extent of anticipated effects of project actions such as increased turbidity and sound from pile driving.

III. STATUS OF THE SPECIES AND HABITAT

This biological and conference opinion analyzes the effects of Tisdale Fish Screen Project on the following threatened and endangered species and designated critical habitat:

Sacramento River winter-run Chinook salmon - endangered
Sacramento River winter-run Chinook salmon - designated critical habitat
Central Valley spring-run Chinook salmon - threatened
Central Valley spring-run Chinook salmon - proposed critical habitat
Central Valley steelhead - threatened
Central Valley steelhead - proposed critical habitat

A. Species Life History, Population Dynamics, and Likelihood of Survival and Recovery

1. Sacramento River winter-run Chinook salmon

Sacramento River winter-run Chinook salmon were originally listed as threatened in November, 1990 (55 FR 46515). Their status was reclassified as endangered in January 1994 (59 FR 440) due to continued decline and increased variability of run sizes since their listing as a threatened species, expected weak returns as a result of two small year classes in 1991 and 1993, and continued threats to the population. In the proposed rule to reclassify the winter-run Chinook salmon as endangered, NOAA Fisheries recognized that the population had dropped nearly 99 percent between 1966 and 1991, and despite conservation measures to improve habitat conditions, the population continued to decline (57 FR 27416). In June 2004 NOAA Fishery proposed to reclassify Sacramento River winter-run Chinook salmon as threatened (69 FR 33102). This determination was based on three main points: 1) harvest and habitat conservation efforts have increased the ESU abundance and productivity over the past decade; 2) artificial propagation programs that are part of the ESU, the Captive Broodstock Programs at Livingston Stone National Fish Hatchery (LSNFH) and at the University of California Bodega Marine Laboratory contribute to the ESU's viability; and 3) CALFED ecosystem restoration plans underway in Battle Creek should provide the opportunity to establish a second winter-run Chinook salmon population. Currently, Sacramento River winter-run Chinook salmon are listed as endangered. A draft recovery plan was published in August 1997 (NOAA Fisheries 1997).

Winter-run Chinook salmon historically spawned in the headwaters of the McCloud, Pit, and Little Sacramento rivers and Hat and Battle creeks. Construction of Shasta Dam in 1943 and Keswick Dam in 1950 blocked access to all of these waters except Battle Creek, which has been severely impacted by hydroelectric facilities and the Coleman National Fish Hatchery (Moyle *et al.* 1989; NOAA Fisheries 1997). Until 1984, the upper Calaveras River also contained a run of several dozen to several hundred fish that spawned below New Hogan Dam. Low river flows in the Calaveras during the 1987-1992 drought are believed to have eliminated this population (DFG 1998). Most of the current winter-run Chinook salmon spawning and rearing habitat exists on the mainstem Sacramento River between Keswick Dam and Red Bluff Diversion Dam (RBDD). Although a small, unknown, number of winter-run Chinook salmon are thought to spawn in Battle Creek, the ESU is widely considered to be reduced to a single naturally spawning population in the mainstem Sacramento River below Keswick Dam.

Following the construction of Shasta Dam, the number of winter-run Chinook salmon initially declined but recovered during the 1960s. This initial recovery was followed by a steady decline from 1969 through the late 1980s (FWS 1999).

Adult winter-run Chinook salmon enter San Francisco Bay from November through June (Hallock and Fisher 1985) and migrate past RBDD from mid-December through early August (NOAA Fisheries 1997). The majority of the run passes RBDD from January through May, and peaks in mid-March (Hallock and Fisher 1985). Generally, winter-run Chinook salmon spawn from near Keswick dam, downstream to Red Bluff. Spawning occurs from late-April through mid-August with peak activity between May and June. Eggs and pre-emergent fry require water temperatures at or below 56 F for maximum survival during the spawning and incubation period (FWS 1999). Fry emerge from mid-June through mid-October and move to river margins and tributary streams to rear. Emigration past RBDD may begin in mid-July and typically peaks in September and can continue through March in dry years (NOAA Fisheries 1997, Vogel and Marine 1991). From 1995 to 1999, all winter-run Chinook salmon outmigrating as fry passed RBDD by October, and all outmigrating pre-smolts and smolts passed RBDD by March (Martin *et al.* 2001).

Construction of RBDD in 1966 enabled improved accuracy of population estimates as salmon passed through fish ladders. From 1967 to 2000, winter-run Chinook salmon estimates were extrapolated from adult counts at RBDD ladders. Recent operational changes at RBDD have allowed a majority of the winter-run Chinook salmon population to bypass the ladders and counting facilities, and has increased the error associated with extrapolating the population estimate. Beginning in 2001, carcass counts replaced the ladder count to reduce the error associated with the estimate.

Since 1967, the estimated adult winter-run Chinook salmon population ranged from 186 in 1994 to 117,808 in 1969 (DFG 2002). The estimate declined from an average of 86,000 adults in 1967-1969 to only 2,000 by 1987-1989, and continued downward to an average 830 fish in 1994-1996. Since then, estimates have increased to an average of 3,136 fish for the period of 1998-2001. Winter-run abundance estimates and cohort replacement rates since 1986 are shown in Table 1. Although the population estimates display broad fluctuation since 1986 (186 in 1994 to 9,757 in 2003), there is an increasing trend in the five year moving average over the last five year period (491 from 1990-1994 to 5,818 from 1999-2003), and a generally stable trend in the five year moving average of cohort replacement rates. The 2003 run was the highest since the listing, with an estimate of 9,757 adult fish.

Table 1.- Winter-run Chinook salmon population estimates from Red Bluff Diversion Dam counts, and corresponding cohort replacement rates for years since 1986. Population estimates include both adult and grilse.

Year	**Population Estimate**	**5 Year Moving Average of Population Estimate**	**Cohort Replacement Rate**	**5 Year Moving Average of Cohort Replacement Rate**
1986	2596	-	-	-
1987	2186	-	-	-
1988	2886	-	-	-
1989	697	-	0.3	-
1990	431	1759	0.2	-
1991	211	1282	0.1	-
1992	1241	1093	1.8	-
1993	387	593	0.9	0.6
1994	186	491	0.9	0.8
1995	1297	664	1.1	0.9
1996	1337	890	3.5	1.6
1997	880	817	4.7	2.2
1998	3002	1340	2.3	2.5
1999	3288	1961	2.5	2.8
2000	1352	1972	1.5	2.9
2001	5521	2809	1.8	2.6
2002	9172	4467	2.3	2.2
2003	9757	5818	7.2	3.2

2. <u>Central Valley Spring-Run Chinook Salmon</u>

NOAA Fisheries listed the Central Valley (CV) spring-run Chinook salmon evolutionarily significant unit (ESU) as threatened on September 16, 1999 (64 FR 50394). In June 2004 NOAA Fisheries proposed that CV spring-run Chinook salmon remain listed as threatened (69 FR 33102). This proposal was based on the recognition that although CV spring-run Chinook salmon productivity trends are positive, the ESU continues to face risks from having a limited number of remaining metapopulations (*i.e.,* three existing populations from an estimated 17 historical populations), a limited geographic distribution, and potential hybridization with Feather River Hatchery spring-run Chinook salmon which are not in the ESU and display genetic similarities to fall-run Chinook salmon.

Historically, spring-run Chinook salmon were the dominant run in the Sacramento River Basin, occupying the middle and upper elevation reaches (1,000 to 6,000 feet) of most streams and rivers with sufficient habitat for over-summering adults (Clark 1929). Clark estimated that there were 6,000 miles of salmon habitat in the Central Valley Basin (much which was high elevation spring-run Chinook salmon habitat) and that by 1928, 80 percent of this habitat had been lost. Yoshiyama *et al.* (1996) determined that, historically, there were approximately 2,000 miles of salmon habitat available prior to dam construction and mining and that only 18 percent of that habitat remains.

Adult CV spring-run Chinook salmon enter the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta (Delta) from the Pacific Ocean beginning in January and enter natal streams from March to July. In Mill Creek, Van Woert (1964) noted that of 18,290 CV spring-run Chinook salmon observed from 1953 to 1963, 93.5 percent were counted between April 1 and July 14, and 89.3 percent were counted between April 29 and June 30.

During their upstream migration, adult Chinook salmon require streamflows sufficient to provide olfactory and other orientation cues used to locate their natal streams. Adequate streamflows also are necessary to allow adult passage to upstream holding habitat. The preferred temperature range for upstream migration is 38° F to 56° F (Bell 1991; DFG 1998).

Upon entering fresh water, spring-run Chinook salmon are sexually immature and must hold in cold water for several months to mature. Typically, spring-run Chinook salmon utilize mid-to high-elevation streams that provide appropriate temperatures and sufficient flow, cover, and pool depth to allow over-summering. Spring-run Chinook salmon also may utilize tailwaters below dams if cold water releases provide suitable habitat conditions. Spawning occurs between September and October and, depending on water temperature, emergence occurs between November and February.

CV spring-run Chinook salmon emigration is highly variable (DFG 1998). Some may begin outmigrating soon after emergence, whereas others oversummer and emigrate as yearlings with the onset of increased fall storms (DFG 1998). The emigration period for CV spring-run

Chinook salmon extends from November to early May, with up to 69 percent of young-of-the-year outmigrants passing through the lower Sacramento River between mid-November and early January (Snider and Titus 2000). Outmigrants also are known to rear in non-natal tributaries to the Sacramento River, and the Delta (DFG 1998).

Chinook salmon spend between one and four years in the ocean before returning to their natal streams to spawn (Myers *et al.* 1998). Fisher (1994) reported that 87 percent of Chinook trapped and examined at RBDD between 1985 and 1991 were three-year-olds.

Spring-run Chinook salmon were once the most abundant run of salmon in the Central Valley (Campbell and Moyle 1992) and were found in both the Sacramento and San Joaquin drainages. More than 500,000 CV spring-run Chinook salmon were caught in the Sacramento-San Joaquin commercial fishery in 1883 alone (Yoshiyama *et al.* 1998). The San Joaquin populations were essentially extirpated by the 1940s, with only small remnants of the run that persisted through the 1950s in the Merced River (Hallock and Van Woert, 1959, Yoshiyama *et al.* 1998). Populations in the upper Sacramento, Feather, and Yuba Rivers were eliminated with the construction of major dams during the1950s and 1960s. Naturally spawning populations of CV spring-run Chinook salmon currently are restricted to accessible reaches of the upper Sacramento River, Antelope Creek, Battle Creek, Beegum Creek, Big Chico Creek, Butte Creek, Clear Creek, Deer Creek, Mill Creek, Feather River, and the Yuba River (DFG 1998).

Since 1969, the CV spring-run Chinook salmon ESU has displayed broad fluctuations in abundance, ranging from 1,403 in 1993 to 25,890 in 1982 (DFG 2003). The average abundance for the ESU was 12,590 for the period of 1969 to 1979, 13,334 for the period of 1980 to 1990, and 6,554 from 1991 to 2001. Evaluating the abundance of the ESU as a whole, however, complicates trend detection. For example, although the mainstem Sacramento River population appears to have undergone a significant decline, the data are not necessarily comparable because coded wire tag information gathered from fall-run Chinook salmon returns since the early 1990s has resulted in adjustments to ladder counts at RBDD that have reduced the overall number of fish that are categorized as CV spring-run Chinook salmon (Colleen Harvey-Arrison, DFG, pers. comm., 2003).

Sacramento River tributary populations in Mill, Deer, and Butte Creeks are probably the best trend indicators for the CV spring-run Chinook ESU as a whole. These streams have shown positive escapement trends since 1991. Recent escapements to Butte Creek, including 20,259 in 1998, 9,605 in 2001 and 8,785 in 2002 (DFG 2002 and DFG 2003), represent the greatest proportion of the ESU's abundance. Although recent trends are positive, annual abundance estimates display a high level of fluctuation, and the overall number of CV spring-run Chinook salmon remains well below estimates of historic abundance. Additionally, in 2003, high water temperatures, high fish densities, and an outbreak of Columnaris Disease (*F. Columnaris*) and Ichthyophthiriasis (*I. multifiis*) contributed to the pre-spawning mortality of an estimated 11, 231 adult spring-run Chinook salmon in Butte Creek. Because the CV spring-run Chinook salmon ESU is confined to relatively few remaining streams; continues to display broad fluctuations in abundance; and a large proportion of the population (*i.e.,* in Butte Creek) faces the risk of high mortality rates, the population is at a moderate to high risk of extinction.

3. Central Valley Steelhead

NOAA Fisheries listed the CV steelhead ESU as threatened on March 19, 1998 (63 FR 13347). The ESU includes all naturally-produced CV steelhead in the Sacramento-San Joaquin River Basin. NOAA Fisheries published a final 4(d) rule for steelhead on July 10, 2000 (65 FR 42422). The 4(d) rule applies the section 9 take prohibitions to threatened species except in cases where the take is associated with State and local programs that are approved by NOAA Fisheries. In June 2004 NOAA Fisheries proposed that CV steelhead remain listed as threatened (69 FR 33102). This proposal is based on the recognition that although the NOAA Fisheries Biological Review Team (BRT) (NOAA Fisheries 2003) found the ESU "in danger of extinction," ongoing protective efforts for this ESU, and the likely implementation of an ESU-wide monitoring program effectively counter this finding. Fisheries also is proposing changes involving steelhead hatchery populations (69 FR 31354). The Coleman National Fish Hatchery and Feather River Fish Hatchery steelhead populations are proposed for inclusion in the listed population of steelhead. These populations previously were included in the ESU but were not deemed essential for conservation and thus not part of the listed steelhead population. Finally, NOAA Fisheries has proposed to include resident *Oncorhynchus mykiss,* present below natural or long-standing artificial barriers, in all steelhead ESU's (69 FR 33102).

All steelhead stocks in the Central Valley are winter-run steelhead (McEwan and Jackson 1996). Steelhead are similar to Pacific salmon in their life history requirements. They are born in fresh water, emigrate to the ocean, and return to freshwater to spawn. Unlike other Pacific salmon, steelhead are capable of spawning more than once before they die.

The majority of the CV steelhead spawning migration occurs from October through February and spawning occurs from December to April in streams with cool, well oxygenated water that is available year round. Van Woert (1964) and Harvey (1995) observed that in Mill Creek, the CV steelhead migration is continuous, and although there are two peak periods, sixty percent of the run is passed by December 30. Similar bimodal run patterns have also been observed in the Feather River (Brad Cavallo, DWR, pers. comm., 2002), and the American River (John Hannon, Bureau of Reclamation, pers. comm., 2002).

Incubation time is dependent upon water temperature. Eggs incubate for one and a half to four months before emerging. Eggs held between 50° and 59° F hatch within three to four weeks (Moyle 1976). Fry emerge from redds within in about four to six weeks depending on redd depth, gravel size, siltation, and temperature (Shapovalov and Taft 1954). Newly emerged fry move to shallow stream margins to escape high water velocities and predation (Barnhart 1986). As fry grow larger they move into riffles and pools and establish feeding locations. Juveniles rear in freshwater for one to four years (Meehan and Bjornn 1991) emigrating episodically from natal springs during fall, winter and spring high flows (Colleen Harvey Arrison, DFG, pers.

comm. 1999). Steelhead typically spend two years in fresh water. Adults spend one to four years at sea before returning to freshwater to spawn as four or five year olds (Moyle 1976).

Steelhead historically were well-distributed throughout the Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers (Busby *et al.* 1996). Steelhead were found from the upper Sacramento and Pit River systems south to the Kings and possible the Kern River systems and in both east- and west-side Sacramento River tributaries (Yoshiyama *et al.* 1996). The present distribution has been greatly reduced (McEwan and Jackson 1996). The California Advisory Committee on Salmon and Steelhead (1988) reported a reduction of steelhead habitat from 6,000 miles historically to 300 miles. The California Fish and Wildlife Plan (DFG 1965) estimated there were 40,000 steelhead in the early 1950s. Hallock *et al.* (1961) estimated an average of 20,540 adult steelhead through the 1960s in the Sacramento River, upstream of the Feather River.

Nobriga and Cadrett (2003) compared CWT and untagged (wild) steelhead smolt catch ratios at Chipps Island trawl from 1998-2001 to estimate that about 100,000 to 300,000 steelhead juveniles are produced naturally each year in the Central Valley. In the draft *Updated Status Review of West Coast Salmon and Steelhead* (NOAA Fisheries 2003), the BRT made the following conclusion based on the Chipps Island data:

> "If we make the fairly generous assumptions (in the sense of generating large estimates of spawners) that average fecundity is 5,000 eggs per female, 1 percent of eggs survive to reach Chipps Island, and 181,000 smolts are produced (the 1998-2000 average), about 3,628 female steelhead spawn naturally in the entire Central Valley. This can be compared with McEwan's (2001) estimate of 1 million to 2 million spawners before 1850, and 40,000 spawners in the 1960s".

The only consistent data available on steelhead numbers in the San Joaquin River basin come from DFG mid-water trawling samples collected on the lower San Joaquin River at Mossdale. These data indicate a decline in steelhead numbers in the early 1990's, which have remained low through 2002 (DFG 2003). In 2003, a total of 12 steelhead smolts were collected at Mossdale (DFG, unpublished data).

Existing wild steelhead stocks in the Central Valley mostly are confined to upper Sacramento River and its tributaries, including Antelope, Deer, and Mill Creeks and the Yuba River. Populations may exist in Big Chico and Butte Creeks and a few wild steelhead are produced in the American and Feather Rivers (McEwan and Jackson 1996). Until recently, CV steelhead were thought to be extirpated from the San Joaquin River system. Recent monitoring has detected populations of steelhead in the Stanislaus, Mokelumne, Calaveras, and other streams previously thought to be void of steelhead (McEwan 2001). Naturally spawning populations may exist in many other streams but are undetected due to lack of monitoring programs (SPWT 1999).

Reliable estimates of CV steelhead abundance for different basins are not available (McEwan 2001), however, McEwan and Jackson (1996) estimate the total annual run size for the entire Sacramento-San Joaquin system, based on RBDD counts, to be no more than 10,000 adults. Steelhead counts at the RBDD have declined from an average of 11,187 for the period of 1967 to 1977, to an average of approximately 2,000 through the 1990s (McEwan and Jackson 1996, McEwan 2001). The future of CV steelhead is uncertain because of the lack of status and trend data.

B. Habitat Condition and Function for Species' Conservation

Critical habitat for winter-run Chinook salmon was designated on June 16, 1993, and includes the Sacramento River from Keswick Dam (RM 302) downstream to Chipps Island (RM O) at the westward margin of the Delta; all waters from Chipps Island westward to Carquinez Bridge, including Honker Bay, Grizzly Bay, Suisun Bay, and Carquinez Strait; all waters of San Pablo Bay westward of the Carquinez Bridge; and all waters of the San Francisco Bay (north of the San Francisco Bay Bridge) from San Pablo Bay to the Golden Gate Bridge. The critical habitat designation identifies those physical and biological features of the habitat that are essential to the conservation of the species and that may require special management consideration or protection. Within the Sacramento River this includes the river water, river bottom (including those areas and associated gravel used by winter-run Chinook salmon as spawning substrate), and adjacent riparian zone used by fry and juveniles for rearing.

NOAA Fisheries proposed to designate critical habitat for CV spring-run Chinook salmon and CV steelhead in December 2004 (69 FR 71880). Proposed critical habitat includes stream channels within certain occupied stream reaches and includes a lateral extent as defined by the ordinary high water mark (33 CFR 329.11) or the bankfull elevation. Critical habitat in estuarine reaches is defined by the perimeter of the water body or the elevation of the extreme high water mark, whichever is greater. The reach of the Sacramento River that contains the action area currently is proposed.

The freshwater habitat of salmon and steelhead in the Central Valley varies in function depending on location. Spawning areas are located in accessible, upstream reaches of the Sacramento or San Joaquin Rivers and their watersheds where viable spawning gravels and water conditions are found. Spawning habitat condition is strongly affected by water flow and quality, especially temperature, dissolved oxygen, and silt load, all of which can greatly affect the survival of eggs and larvae.

Migratory corridors are downstream of the spawning area and include the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta. These corridors allow the upstream passage of adults, and the downstream emigration of outmigrant juveniles. Migratory habitat condition is strongly affected by the presence of barriers, which can include dams, unscreened or poorly- screened diversions, and degraded water quality.

Both spawning areas and migratory corridors comprise rearing habitat for juveniles, which feed and grow before and during their outmigration. Non-natal, intermittent tributaries also may be used for juvenile rearing. Rearing habitat condition is strongly affected by habitat complexity, food supply, and presence of predators of juvenile salmonids. Some complex, productive habitats with floodplains remain in the system (*e.g.*, the lower Cosumnes River, Sacramento River reaches with setback levees [*i.e.*, primarily located upstream of the City of Colusa]). However, the channelized, leveed, and rip-rapped river reaches and sloughs that are common in the Sacramento-San Joaquin system typically have low habitat complexity, low abundance of food organisms, and offer little protection from either fish or avian predators.

C. Factors Affecting the Species and Habitat

A number of documents have addressed the history of human activities, present environmental conditions, and factors contributing to the decline of salmon and steelhead species in the Central Valley. For example, NOAA Fisheries prepared range-wide status reviews for west coast Chinook salmon (Myers *et al.* 1998) and steelhead (Busby *et al.* 1996). Also, the NOAA BRT published a draft updated status review for west coast Chinook salmon and steelhead in November 2003 (NOAA Fisheries 2003). Information also is available in Federal Register notices announcing ESA listing proposals and determinations for some of these species and their critical habitat (*e.g.*, 58 FR 33212; 59 FR 440; 62 FR 24588; 62 FR 43937; 63 FR 13347; 64 FR 24049; 64 FR 50394; 65 FR 7764). The Final Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement/Report (EIS/EIR) for the CALFED Bay-Delta Program (CALFED 1999), the Final Programmatic EIS for the CVPIA (DOI 1999) provide a summary of historical and recent environmental conditions for salmon and steelhead in the Central Valley. The following general description of the factors affecting the viability of Sacramento River winter-run Chinook salmon, CV spring-run Chinook salmon, CV steelhead is based on a summarization of these documents.

In general, the human activities that have affected the listed anadromous salmonids and their habitats addressed in this opinion consist of: 1) dam construction that blocks previously accessible habitat; 2) water development and management activities that affect water quantity, flow timing, and quality; 3) land use activities such as agriculture, flood control, urban development, mining, road construction, and logging that degrade aquatic and riparian habitat; 4) hatchery operation and practices; 5) harvest activities; 6) predation; and 7) ecosystem restoration actions.

1. Habitat Blockage

Hydropower, flood control, and water supply dams of the CVP, SWP, and other municipal and private entities have permanently blocked or hindered salmonid access to historical spawning and rearing grounds. Clark (1929) estimated that originally there were 6,000 miles of salmon habitat in the Central Valley system and that 80 percent of this habitat had been lost by 1928. Yoshiyama *et al.* (1996) calculated that roughly 2,000 miles of salmon habitat was actually available before dam construction and mining, and concluded that 82 percent is not accessible today.

In general, large dams on every major tributary to the Sacramento River, San Joaquin River, and Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta block salmon and steelhead access to the upper portions of the respective watersheds. On the Sacramento River, Keswick Dam blocks passage to historic spawning and rearing habitat in the upper Sacramento, McCloud, and Pit rivers. Whiskeytown Dam blocks access to the upper watershed of Clear Creek. Oroville Dam and associated facilities block passage to the upper Feather River watershed. Nimbus Dam blocks access to most of the American River basin. Friant Dam construction in the mid-1940's has been associated with the elimination of spring-run Chinook salmon in the San Joaquin River upstream of the Merced River (DOI 1999). On the Stanislaus River, construction of New Melones Dam and Goodwin Dam blocked both spring and fall-run Chinook salmon (DFG 2001).

As a result of the dams, Sacramento River winter-run Chinook salmon, CV Chinook salmon, and CV steelhead populations on these rivers have been confined to lower elevation mainstems that historically only were used for migration. Population abundances have declined in these streams due to decreased quantity and quality of spawning and rearing habitat. Higher temperatures at these lower elevations during late-summer and fall are a major stressor to adults and juvenile salmonids.

The Suisun Marsh Salinity Control Gates (SMSCG), located on Montezuma Slough, were installed in 1988, and are operated with gates and flashboards to decrease the salinity levels of managed wetlands in Suisun Marsh. The SMSCG have delayed or blocked passage of adult Chinook salmon migrating upstream (Edwards *et al.* 1996; Tillman *et al.* 1996; DWR 2002).

2. Water Development

The diversion and storage of natural flows by dams and diversion structures on Central Valley waterways have depleted stream flows and altered the natural cycles by which juvenile and adult salmonids base their migrations. Depleted flows have contributed to higher temperatures, lower dissolved oxygen levels, and decreased recruitment of gravel and large woody debris. Furthermore, more uniform flows year round have resulted in diminished natural channel formation, altered foodweb processes, and slower regeneration of riparian vegetation. These stable flow patterns have reduced bedload movement (Ayers 2001) and caused spawning gravels to become embedded, and reduced channel width, which has decreased the available spawning and rearing habitat below dams.

Water diversions for irrigated agriculture, municipal and industrial use, and managed wetlands are found throughout the Central Valley. Hundreds of small and medium-size water diversions exist along the Sacramento River, San Joaquin River, and their tributaries. Although efforts have been made in recent years to screen some of these diversions, many remain unscreened. Depending on the size, location, and season of operation, these unscreened intakes entrain and kill many life stages of aquatic species, including juvenile salmonids. For example, as of 1997, 98.5 percent of the 3,356 diversions included in a Central Valley database were either unscreened or screened insufficiently to prevent fish entrainment (Herren and Kawasaki 2001). Most of the 370 water diversions operating in Suisun Marsh are unscreened (FWS 2003).

Outmigrant juvenile salmonids in the Delta have been subjected to adverse environmental conditions created by water export operations at the CVP/SWP. Specifically, juvenile salmonid survival has been reduced from 1) water diversion from the mainstem Sacramento River into the Central Delta via the Delta Cross Channel; 2) upstream or reverse flows of water in the lower San Joaquin River and southern Delta waterways; 3) entrainment at the CVP/SWP export facilities and associated problems at Clifton Court Forebay; and 4) increased exposure to introduced, non-native predators such as striped bass (*Morone saxatilis*), largemouth bass (*Micropterus salmoides*), and American shad (*Alosa sapidissima*).

3. Land Use Activities

Land use activities continue to have large impacts on salmonid habitat in the Central Valley. Until about 150 years ago, the Sacramento River was bordered by up to 500,000 acres of riparian forest, with bands of vegetation extending outward for four or five miles (California Resources Agency 1989). By 1979, riparian habitat along the Sacramento River had diminished to 11,000 to 12,000 acres, or about 2 percent of historic levels (McGill 1987). The degradation and fragmentation of riparian habitat had resulted mainly from flood control and bank protection projects, together with the conversion of riparian land to agriculture (Jones and Stokes Associates, Incorporated 1993).

Increased sedimentation resulting from agricultural and urban practices within the Central Valley is a primary cause of salmonid habitat degradation (NOAA Fisheries 1996). Sedimentation can adversely affect salmonids during all freshwater life stages by; clogging, or abrading gill surfaces, adhering to eggs, hamper fry emergence (Phillips and Campbell 1961); burying eggs or alevins; scouring and filling in pools and riffles; reducing primary productivity and photosynthesis activity (Cordone and Kelley 1961); and affecting intergravel permeability and dissolved oxygen levels. Excessive sedimentation over time can cause substrates to become embedded, which reduces successful salmonid spawning, and egg and fry survival (Hartmann *et al.* 1987).

Land use activities associated with road construction, urban development, logging, mining, agriculture, and recreation have significantly altered fish habitat quantity and quality through alteration of streambank and channel morphology; alteration of ambient water temperatures; degradation of water quality; elimination of spawning and rearing habitat; fragmentation of available habitats; elimination of downstream recruitment of LWD; and removal of riparian vegetation resulting in increased streambank erosion (Meehan and Bjornn 1991). Agricultural practices in the Central Valley have eliminated large trees and logs and other woody debris that would otherwise be recruited into the stream channel (NOAA Fisheries 1998). LWD influences stream morphology by affecting channel pattern, position, and geometry, as well as pool formation (Keller and Swanson 1979; Bilby 1984; Robison and Beschta 1990).

Since the 1850s, wetlands reclamation for urban and agricultural development has caused the cumulative loss of 79 and 94 percent of the tidal marsh habitat in the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta downstream and upstream of Chipp's Island, respectively (Monroe and Kelly 1992; Goals Project 1999). In Suisun Marsh, salt water intrusion and land subsidence gradually has led to the decline of agricultural production. Presently, Suisun Marsh consists largely of tidal sloughs and managed wetlands for duck clubs.

Juvenile salmonids are exposed to increased water temperatures in the Delta during the late spring and summer due to the loss of riparian shading, and by thermal inputs from municipal, industrial, and agricultural discharges. Studies by the California Department of Water Resources (DWR) on water quality in the Delta over the last 30 years show a steady decline in the food sources available for juvenile salmonids and an increase in the clarity of the water. These conditions have contributed to increased mortality of juvenile Chinook salmon and steelhead as they move through the Delta.

4. Hatchery Operations and Practices

Five hatcheries currently produce Chinook salmon in the Central Valley and four of these also produce steelhead. Releasing large numbers of hatchery fish can pose a threat to wild Chinook salmon and steelhead stocks through genetic impacts, competition for food and other resources between hatchery and wild fish, predation of hatchery fish on wild fish, and increased fishing pressure on wild stocks as a result of hatchery production (Waples 1991). The genetic impacts of artificial propagation programs in the Central Valley primarily are caused by straying of hatchery fish and the subsequent interbreeding of hatchery fish with wild fish. In the Central Valley, practices such as transferring eggs between hatcheries and trucking smolts to distant sites for release contribute to elevated straying levels (DOI 1999). For example, Nimbus Hatchery on the American River rears Eel River steelhead stock and releases these fish in the Sacramento River.

Hatchery practices as well as spatial and temporal overlaps of habitat use and spawning activity between spring- and fall-run fish have led to the hybridization and homogenization of some subpopulations (DFG 1998). As early as the 1960's, Slater (1963) observed that early fall- and spring-run Chinook salmon were competing for spawning sites in the Sacramento River below Keswick Dam, and speculated that the two runs may have hybridized. Feather River Hatchery (FRH) spring-run Chinook salmon have been documented as straying throughout the Central Valley for many years (DFG 1998), and in many cases have been recovered from the spawning grounds of fall-run Chinook salmon (Colleen Harvey-Arrison and Paul Ward, DFG, pers. comm., 2002), an indication that FRH spring-run Chinook salmon may exhibit fall-run life history characteristics. Although the degree of hybridization has not been comprehensively determined, it is clear that the populations of spring-run Chinook salmon spawning in the Feather River and counted at RBDD contain hybridized fish.

The management of hatcheries, such as Nimbus Hatchery and FRH, can directly impact CV spring-run Chinook salmon and CV steelhead populations by overproducing the natural capacity of the limited habitat available below dams. In the case of the Feather River, significant redd superimposition occurs in-river due to hatchery overproduction and the inability to physically separate CV spring-run and fall-run Chinook salmon adults. This concurrent spawning has led to hybridization between the spring- and fall-run Chinook salmon in the Feather River. At Nimbus Hatchery, operating Folsom Dam to meet temperature requirements for returning hatchery fall-run Chinook salmon often limits the amount if water available for steelhead spawning and rearing the rest of the year.

The increase in Central Valley hatchery production has reversed the composition of the steelhead population, from 88 percent naturally-produced fish in the 1950s (McEwan 2001) to an estimated 23 to 37 percent naturally-produced fish currently (Nobriga and Cadrett 2001). The increase in hatchery steelhead production proportionate to the wild population has reduced the viability of the wild steelhead populations, increased the use of out-of-basin stocks for hatchery production, and increased straying (NOAA Fisheries 2001). Thus, the ability of natural populations to successfully reproduce has likely been diminished.

The relatively low number of spawners needed to sustain a hatchery population can result in high harvest-to-escapements ratios in waters where regulations are set according to hatchery population. This can lead to over-exploitation and reduction in size of wild populations coexisting in the same system (McEwan 2001).

Hatcheries also can have some positive effects on salmonid populations. Artificial propagation has been shown effective in bolstering the numbers of naturally spawning fish in the short term under certain conditions, and in conserving genetic resources and guarding against catastrophic loss of naturally spawned populations at critically low abundance levels, such as Sacramento River winter-run Chinook salmon. However, relative abundance is only one component of a viable salmonid population.

5. Ocean and Sport Harvest

Extensive ocean recreational and commercial troll fisheries for Chinook salmon exist along the Central California coast, and an inland recreational fishery exists in the Central Valley for Chinook salmon and steelhead. Ocean harvest of Central Valley Chinook salmon is estimated using an abundance index, called the Central Valley Index (CVI). The CVI is the ratio of Chinook salmon harvested south of Point Arena (where 85 percent of Central Valley Chinook salmon are caught) to escapement. Coded wire tag returns indicate that Sacramento River salmon congregate off the coast between Point Arena and Morro Bay.

Historically in California, almost half of the river sportfishing effort was in the Sacramento-San Joaquin River system, particularly upstream from the city of Sacramento (Emmett *et al.* 1991). Since 1987, the Fish and Game Commission has adopted increasingly stringent regulations to reduce and virtually eliminate the in-river sport fishery for winter-run Chinook salmon. Present regulations include a year-round closure to Chinook salmon fishing between Keswick Dam and the Deschutes Road Bridge and a rolling closure to Chinook salmon fishing on the Sacramento River between the Deschutes River Bridge and the Carquinez Bridge. The rolling closure spans the months that migrating adult winter-run Chinook salmon are ascending the Sacramento River to their spawning grounds. These closures have virtually eliminated impacts on winter-run Chinook salmon caused by recreational angling in freshwater. In 1992, the California Fish and Game Commission adopted gear restrictions (all hooks must be barbless and a maximum of 5.7 cm in length) to minimize hooking injury and mortality of winter-run Chinook salmon caused by trout anglers.

In-river recreational fisheries historically have taken CV spring-run Chinook salmon throughout the species' range. During the summer, holding adult CV spring-run Chinook salmon are easily targeted by angler's when they congregate in large pools. Poaching also occurs at fish ladders, and other areas where adults congregate; however, the significance of poaching on the adult population is unknown. Specific regulations for the protection of CV spring-run Chinook salmon in Mill, Deer, Butte and Big Chico creeks were added to the existing DFG regulations in 1994. The current regulations, including those developed for winter-run Chinook salmon, provide some level of protection for CV spring-run Chinook salmon (DFG 1998).

There is little information on steelhead harvest rates in California. Hallock *et al.* (1961) estimated that harvest rates for Sacramento River steelhead from the 1953-54 through 1958-59 seasons ranged from 25.1 percent to 45.6 percent assuming a 20 percent non-return rate of tags. Staley (1975) estimated the harvest rate in the American River during the 1971-1972 and 1973-74 seasons to be 27 percent. The average annual harvest rate of adult steelhead above Red Bluff Diversion Dam for the three year period from 1991-92 through 1993-94 was 16 percent (McEwan and Jackson 1996). Since 1998, all hatchery steelhead have been marked with an adipose fin clip allowing anglers to distinguish hatchery and wild steelhead. Current regulations restrict anglers from keeping unmarked steelhead in Central Valley streams (DFG 2004). Overall, this regulation has greatly increased protection of naturally produced adult CV steelhead.

6. Predation

Accelerated predation also may be a factor in the decline of winter-run Chinook salmon and CV spring-run Chinook salmon, and to a lesser degree CV steelhead. Additionally, human-induced habitat changes such alteration of natural flow regimes and installation of bank revetment and structures such as dams, bridges, water diversions, piers, and wharves often provide conditions that both disorient juvenile salmonids and attract predators (Stevens 1961; Vogel *et al.* 1988; Garcia 1989; Decato 1978).

On the mainstem Sacramento River, high rates of predation are known to occur at RBDD, ACID, GCID, areas where rock revetment has replaced natural river bank vegetation, and at south Delta water diversion structures (*e.g.*, Clifton Court Forebay; DFG 1998). Predation at RBDD on juvenile winter-run Chinook salmon is believed to be higher than normal due to factors such as water quality and flow dynamics associated with the operation of this structure. Due to their small size, early emigrating winter-run Chinook salmon may be very susceptible to predation in Lake Red Bluff when the RBDD gates remain closed in summer and early fall (Vogel *et al.* 1988). In passing the dam, juveniles are subject to conditions which greatly disorient them, making them highly susceptible to predation by fish or birds. Sacramento pikeminnow (*Ptychocheilus grandis*) and striped bass (*Morone saxatilis*) congregate below the dam and prey on juvenile salmon.

FWS found that more predatory fish were found at rock revetment bank protection sites between Chico Landing and Red Bluff than at sites with naturally eroding banks (Michny and Hampton 1984). From October 1976 to November 1993, DFG conducted ten mark/recapture experiments at the SWP's Clifton Court Forebay to estimate pre-screen losses using hatchery-reared juvenile Chinook salmon. Pre-screen losses ranged from 69 percent to 99 percent. Predation from striped bass is thought to be the primary cause of the loss (Gingras 1997).

Other locations in the Central Valley where predation is of concern include flood bypasses, release sites for salmonids salvaged at the State and Federal fish facilities, and the Suisun Marsh Salinity Control Structure. Predation on salmon by striped bass and pikeminnow at salvage release sites in the Delta and lower Sacramento River has been documented (Orsi 1967; Pickard *et al.* 1982). Predation rates at these sites are difficult to determine. DFG conducted predation studies from 1987-1993 at the Suisun Marsh Salinity Control Structure to determine if the structure attracts and concentrates predators. The dominant predator species at the structure was striped bass, and juvenile Chinook salmon were identified in their stomach contents (NOAA Fisheries 1997).

7. <u>Ecosystem Restoration</u>

a. *California Bay-Delta Authority* (CALFED)

Two programs under CALFED, the Ecosystem Restoration Program (ERP) and the Environmental Water Account (EWA), were created to improve conditions for fish, including listed salmonids, in the Central Valley. Restoration actions implemented by the ERP include the installation of fish screens, modification of barriers to improve fish passage, habitat acquisition, and instream habitat restoration. The majority of these recent actions address key factors affecting listed salmonids, and emphasis has been placed in tributary drainages with high potential for CV steelhead and CV spring-run Chinook salmon production. Additional ongoing actions include new efforts to enhance fisheries monitoring and directly support salmonid production through hatchery releases. Recent habitat restoration initiatives sponsored and funded primarily by the CALFED-ERP Program have resulted in plans to restore ecological function to 9,543 acres of shallow-water tidal and marsh habitats within the Delta. Restoration of these areas primarily involves flooding lands previously used for agriculture, thereby creating additional rearing habitat for juvenile salmonids. Similar habitat restoration is imminent adjacent to Suisun Marsh (*i.e.*, at the confluence of Montezuma Slough and the Sacramento River) as part of the Montezuma Wetlands project, which is intended to provide for commercial disposal of material dredged from San Francisco Bay in conjunction with tidal wetland restoration.

A sub-program of the ERP called the Environmental Water Program (EWP) has been established to support ERP projects through enhancement of instream flows that are biologically and ecologically significant. This program is in the development stage and the benefits to listed salmonids are not yet clear. Clear Creek is one of five watersheds in the Central Valley that has been targeted for action during Phase I of this program.

The Environmental Water Account (EWA) is geared to providing water at critical times to meet ESA requirements and incidental take limits without water supply impacts to other users. In early 2001, EWA released 290,000 acre-feet of water at key times to offset reductions in south Delta pumping to protect winter-run Chinook salmon, delta smelt, and splittail. The actual number of fish saved was very small. The anticipated benefits to fisheries from EWA were much higher than what has actually occurred.

b. *Central Valley Project Improvement Act*

The Central Valley Project Improvement Act implemented in 1992 requires that fish and wildlife get equal consideration with water allocations from the Central Valley Project. From this act arose two programs that have benefitted listed salmonids: the Anadromous Fish Restoration Program (AFRP) and the Water Acquisition Program (WAP). The AFRP has engaged in monitoring, education, and restoration projects geared toward recovery of all anadromous fish species residing in the Central Valley. Restoration projects funded through the AFRP include fish passage, fish screening, riparian easement and land acquisition, development of watershed planning groups, instream and riparian habitat improvement, and gravel replenishment. The goal of the WAP is to acquire water supplies to meet the habitat restoration and enhancement goals of the CVPIA and to improve the Department of the Interior's ability to meet regulatory water quality requirements. Water has been used successfully to improve fish habitat for CV spring-run Chinook salmon and CV steelhead by maintaining or increasing instream flows in Butte and Mill Creeks and the San Joaquin River at critical times.

c. *Iron Mountain Mine Remediation*

The Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) Iron Mountain Mine remediation involves the removal of toxic metals in acidic mine drainage from the Spring Creek Watershed with a state-of-the-art lime neutralization plant. Contaminant loading into the Sacramento River from Iron Mountain Mine has shown measurable reductions since the early 1990s. Decreasing the heavy metal contaminants that enter the Sacramento River should increase the survival of salmonid eggs and juveniles. However, during periods of heavy rainfall upstream of the Iron Mountain Mine, Reclamation substantially increases Sacramento River flows in order to dilute heavy metal contaminants being spilled from Spring Creek debris dam. This rapid change in flows can cause juvenile salmonids to become stranded or isolated in side channels below Keswick Dam.

d. *SWP Delta Pumping Plant Fish Protection Agreement (Four-Pumps Agreement)*

The Four Pumps Agreement Program has approved about $49 million for projects that benefit salmon and steelhead production in the Sacramento-San Joaquin basins and Delta since the agreement inception in 1986. Four Pumps projects that benefit CV spring-run Chinook salmon and CV steelhead include water exchange programs on Mill and Deer Creeks; enhanced law enforcement efforts from San Francisco Bay upstream to the Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers and their tributaries; design and construction of fish screens and ladders on Butte Creek; and screening of diversions in Suisun Marsh and San Joaquin tributaries. Predator habitat isolation and removal, and spawning habitat enhancement projects on the San Joaquin tributaries benefit CV steelhead.

The Spring-run Salmon Increased Protection project provides overtime wages for DFG wardens to focus on reducing illegal take and illegal water diversions on upper Sacramento River tributaries and adult holding areas, where the fish are vulnerable to poaching. This project covers Mill, Deer, Antelope, Butte, Big Chico, Cottonwood, and Battle Creeks, and has been in effect since 1996. Through the Delta-Bay Enhanced Enforcement Program (DBEEP), initiated in 1994, a team of ten wardens focus their enforcement efforts on salmon, steelhead, and other species of concern from the San Francisco Bay Estuary upstream into the Sacramento and San Joaquin River basins. These two enhanced enforcement programs, in combination with additional concern and attention from local landowners and watershed groups on the Sacramento River tributaries which support CV spring-run Chinook salmon summer holding habitat, have been shown to reduce the amount of poaching in these upstream areas.

The provisions of funds to cover over-budget costs for the Durham Mutual/Parrot Phelan Screen and Ladders project expedited completion of the construction phase of this project which was completed during 1996. The project continues to benefit salmon and steelhead by facilitating upstream passage of adult spawners and downstream passage of juveniles.

The Mill and Deer Creek Water Exchange projects are designed to provide new wells that enable diverters to bank groundwater in place of stream flow, thus leaving water in the stream during critical migration periods. On Mill Creek several agreements between Los Molinos Mutual Water Company (LMMWC), Orange Cove Irrigation District (OCID), DFG, and DWR allows DWR to pump groundwater from two wells into the LMMWC canals to pay back LMMWC water rights for surface water released downstream for fish. Although the Mill Creek Water Exchange project was initiated in 1990 and the agreement for a well capacity of 25 cfs, only 12 cfs has been developed to date (Reclamation and OCID 1999). In addition, it has been determined that a base flow of greater than 25 cfs is needed during the April through June period for upstream passage of adult CV spring-run Chinook salmon in Mill Creek (Reclamation and OCID 1999). In some years, water diversions from the creek are curtailed by amounts sufficient to provide for passage of upstream migrating adult CV spring-run Chinook salmon and downstream migrating juvenile CV steelhead and CV spring-run Chinook salmon. However, the current arrangement does not ensure adequate flow conditions will be maintained in all years. DWR, DFG, and FWS have developed the Mill Creek Adaptive Management Enhancement Plan to address the instream flow issues. A pilot project using one of the ten pumps originally proposed for Deer Creek was tested in summer 2003. Future testing is planned with implementation to follow.

IV. ENVIRONMENTAL BASELINE

The environmental baseline is an analysis of the effects of past and ongoing human and natural factors leading to the status of the species within the action area. The environmental baseline "includes the past and present impacts of all Federal, State, or private actions and other human activities in the action area, the anticipated impacts of all proposed Federal projects in the action area that have already undergone formal or early section 7 consultation, and the impact of State or private actions which are contemporaneous with the consultation in process" (50 CFR §402.02).

A. Status of the Species and Habitat in the Action Area

The entire action area lies within designated critical habitat of the Sacramento River winter-run Chinook salmon. The action area also provides habitat for CV spring-run Chinook salmon and CV steelhead. The action area is within a reach of the mainstem Sacramento River that is confined by levees, protected by rock riprap, and lined with sparse amounts of Shaded Riverine Aquatic (SRA) Cover. The essential habitat elements in the action area are the water, substrate, and SRA Cover.

1. Status of the Species Within the Action Area

The action area functions as a migratory corridor for adult Sacramento River winter-run Chinook salmon, CV spring-run Chinook salmon and CV steelhead, and provides migration and rearing habitat for juveniles of these species. A large proportion of all federally-listed Central Valley salmonids are expected to utilize aquatic habitat within the action area.

a. *Sacramento River Winter-run Chinook Salmon*

Sacramento River winter-run Chinook salmon are currently only present in the Sacramento River below Keswick Dam, and are composed of a single breeding population (NOAA Fisheries 1997; see *III. Status of the Species and Critical Habitat*). The entire population of migrating adults and emigrating juveniles must pass through the action area.

The migration timing of listed salmon and steelhead in the action area can be approximated by assessing studies that examine run timing in the Sacramento River (*e.g.*, Snider and Titus 2000; Hallock *et al.* 1957; Van Woert 1958; Vogel and Marine 1991). Adults enter San Francisco Bay from November through June (Van Woert 1958), and migrate up the Sacramento River from December through early August (Vogel and Marine 1991). Juvenile Chinook salmon emigrate through the action area from late fall to spring. Snider and Titus (2000) observed that juvenile salmon emigrate through the lower Sacramento River, at Knights Landing, in three phases. The first phase is the initiation of emigration that is strongly linked to initial Sacramento River flow increases between mid-November and early January. Approximately 78 percent of winter-run Chinook salmon emigrate during this phase. The second phase is characterized by sustained high Sacramento River flows between early January and early March, and the third phase typically occurs one week after the release of fall-run Chinook salmon from the Coleman National Fish Hatchery. The remaining proportion of juvenile winter-run Chinook salmon emigrate during these last two phases. The age structure of emigrating juveniles is dominated by young-of-the-year fry, but also may contain some yearlings.

b. Central Valley Spring-run Chinook Salmon

Central Valley spring-run Chinook salmon populations currently spawn in the Sacramento River below Keswick Dam, the low-flow channel of the Feather River, and in Sacramento River tributaries including Mill, Deer, Antelope, and Butte Creeks (DFG 1998). The entire population of migrating adults and emigrating juveniles must pass through the action area.

Adult CV spring-run Chinook salmon enter the mainstem Sacramento River in February and March, and continue to their upstream migration into June and July (DFG 1998). In the Sacramento River, juveniles may begin migrating downstream almost immediately following emergence from the gravel with most emigration occurring from December through March (Moyle *et al.* 1989, Vogel and Marine 1991). Snider and Titus (2000) observed that up to 69 percent of CV spring-run Chinook salmon emigrate during the first migration phase between November and early January. The remainder of the CV spring-run Chinook salmon emigrate during subsequent phases that extend into early June. The age structure of emigrating juveniles is comprised of young-of-the-year and yearlings. The exact composition of the age structure is not known, although populations from Mill and Deer Creek primarily emigrate as yearlings (Colleen Harvey-Arrison, DFG, pers. comm., 2004).

c. *Central Valley Steelhead*

CV steelhead populations currently spawn in tributaries to the Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers. The proportion of CV steelhead in this ESU that migrate through the action area is unknown. However, because of the relatively large amount of suitable habitat in the Sacramento River relative to the San Joaquin River, it is probably high. Adult CV steelhead may be present in the action area from June through March, with the peak occurring between August and October (Bailey 1954, Hallock *et al.* 1957). Juvenile steelhead emigrate through the action area from late fall to spring. Snider and Titus (2000) observed that juvenile steelhead emigration primarily occurs between November and June. The majority of juvenile steelhead emigrate as yearlings.

2. Status of Habitat Within the Action Area

The action area is within designated critical habitat for Sacramento River winter-run Chinook salmon, and proposed critical habitat for CV spring-run Chinook salmon and CV steelhead. Habitat requirements for these species are similar. The essential features of freshwater salmonid habitat within the action include: adequate substrate, water quality, water quantity, water temperature, water velocity, cover/shelter, food; riparian vegetation, space, and safe passage conditions.

Within the action area, the Sacramento River has been transformed from a meandering waterway lined with a dense riparian corridor, to a highly leveed system under varying degrees of control over riverine erosional processes and flooding. Near RM 118, different types of riprap comprise the majority of shoreline habitat. Much of this existing riprap is located along the lower third of the levee, near or below the water surface. Due to the sparsity of riparian vegetation, LWD recruitment is low.

Water temperatures in the action area generally are most favorable for anadromous fish during the winter and spring months and may be warmer than desired conditions from late spring through early fall. High water temperatures primarily are caused by ambient air temperatures, but also are affected by the lack of riparian shading, and by thermal inputs from agricultural outfall water.

Habitat within the action area is primarily used as juvenile rearing habitat and as a migrational corridor for adults and juveniles. The condition and function of this habitat has been severely impaired through several factors discussed in the *Status of the Species and Habitat* section of this biological and conference opinion, including agricultural water development and land use practices, predation, and habitat fragmentation. The result has been the reduction in quantity and quality of essential habitat elements that are required by juveniles to survive and grow, such as water contamination and loss of shallow-water rearing and refugia habitat. In spite of the degraded condition, the importance of the area to the species is high because it is used for extended periods of time by a large proportion of all federally-listed anadromous fish species in the Central Valley. However, due to the currently degraded condition the function of the habit is low.

B. Factors Affecting the Species and Habitat in the Action Area

The magnitude and duration of peak flows during the winter and spring are reduced by water impoundment in upstream reservoirs. Instream flows during the summer and early fall months have increased over historic levels for deliveries of municipal and agricultural water supplies. Overall, water management now reduces natural variability by creating more uniform flows year-round. Current flood control practices require peak flood discharges to be held back and released over a period of weeks. Consequently, the mainstream of the river often remains too high and turbid to provide quality rearing habitat.

Levee construction and bank protection have affected salmonid habitat availability and the processes that develop and maintain preferred habitat by reducing floodplain connectivity, changing riverbank substrate size, and decreasing riparian habitat and SRA Cover. Individual bank protection sites typically range from a few hundred to a few thousand linear feet in length. Such bank protection generally results in two levels of impacts to the environment: 1) site-level impacts which affect the basic physical habitat structure at individual bank protection sites; and 2) reach-level impacts which are the accumulated impacts to ecosystem functions and processes that accrue from multiple bank protection sites within a given river reach (FWS 2000). Revetted embankments result in loss of sinuosity and braiding and reduce the amount of aquatic habitat.

The use of rock armoring limits recruitment of LWD because the relatively smooth and homogenous surface facilities the downstream transportation on instream debris, and greatly reduces, if not eliminates, the retention of LWD once it enters the river channel. Riprapping creates a relatively clean, smooth surface which diminishes the ability of LWD to become securely snagged and anchored by sediment. LWD tends to become only temporarily snagged along riprap, and generally moves downstream with subsequent high flows. Habitat value and ecological function are thus greatly reduced, because wood needs to remain in place to generate maximum values to fish and wildlife (FWS 2000). Recruitment of LWD is limited to any eventual, long-term tree mortality and whatever abrasion and breakage may occur during high flows (FWS 2000). Juvenile salmonids are likely being impacted by reductions, fragmentation, and general lack of connectedness of remaining nearshore refuge areas because it reduces the amount of high value habitat available for them to rear and grow, and makes them more susceptible to predation in the open water.

High water temperatures also limit habitat availability for listed salmonids in the lower Sacramento River (Boles et al. 1988). High summer water temperatures in the lower Sacramento River can exceed 72° F, and create a thermal barrier to the migration of adult and juvenile salmonids (Rich 1997, Kjelson et al. 1982). In addition, water diversions, for agricultural and municipal purposes have reduced river flows and increased temperatures during the critical summer months limiting the survival of juvenile salmonids (Reynolds et al. 1993).

Water diversions also entrain and kill juvenile and adult salmon and steelhead. The Tisdale Pumping Plant No. 1 was installed in 1919 and Pumping Plant No. 2 was installed in 1940. The pumping plants have been operated as unscreened diversions since their initial installation. Entrainment monitoring and entrainment studies have documented losses for juvenile Chinook salmon and steelhead (Hanson 1996, Hanson and Bemis 1997, Hanson 2001, Hallock and Van Woert 1954). Hallock and Van Woert used a fyke net in the Sutter Mutual Water Company's Tisdale plants No. 1 and 2. Nets sampled the discharge from two 48-inch diameter pumps between May 23 and September 18, 1954. 37 juvenile salmon were captured in 479 hours of netting. Hanson (2001) used fishery monitoring data at the RD 108 Wilkins Slough pumping station, and at RD 1004 to establish a reasonable likelihood that listed juvenile salmonids are also taken at Sutter Mutual pump stations.

C. Likelihood of species continued use of habitat within the action area

The Tisdale Fish Screen Project site is located within a reach of the Sacramento River that is utilized by nearly all listed anadromous fish populations within the Sacramento River Basin. Winter-run Chinook salmon, CV spring-run Chinook salmon, and CV steelhead will continue to utilize the action area as a migratory corridor and for rearing. Because of the size and location of the action area, a large proportion of each ESU utilizes the action area as a migratory corridor or for rearing, making it an important node of habitat for the survival and recovery of Sacramento River winter-run Chinook salmon, CV spring-run Chinook salmon, and CV steelhead.

V. EFFECTS OF THE ACTION

This section discusses the direct and indirect effects of the construction and operation of the Tisdale Fish Screen Project on Sacramento River winter-run Chinook salmon, CV spring-run Chinook salmon, and CV steelhead, and/or their designated critical habitat that are expected to result from the proposed action. Cumulative effects (*i.e.*, effects of future State, local, or private actions on endangered and threatened species or critical habitat) are discussed separately.

A. Approach to the Assessment

Pursuant to section 7(a)(2) of the ESA (16 U.S.C. §1536), Federal agencies are directed to ensure that their activities are not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of any listed species or result in the destruction or adverse modification of critical habitat. This biological and conference opinion assesses the effects of the construction, and operations and maintenance of Tisdale Fish Screen Project on endangered Sacramento River winter-run Chinook salmon, threatened CV spring-run Chinook salmon, threatened CV steelhead, and the designated critical habitat of Sacramento River winter-run Chinook salmon. Impacts related to replacement of nearshore aquatic habitat with the fish screen structure also will be assessed. The Tisdale Fish Screen Project is likely to cause adverse short-term effects to listed species and critical habitat during construction, and provide long-term protection from entrainment. The project includes integrated design features to avoid and minimize many potential on-site impacts. The project also includes off-site conservation measures to compensate for unavoidable temporal and spatial impacts.

In the *Description of the Proposed Action* section of this biological and conference opinion, NOAA Fisheries provided an overview of the action. In the *Status of the Species* and *Environmental Baseline* sections of this biological and conference opinion, NOAA Fisheries provided an overview of the threatened and endangered species and critical habitat that are likely to be adversely affected by the activity under consultation.

Regulations that implement section 7(b)(2) of the ESA require biological and conference opinions to evaluate the direct and indirect effects of Federal actions and actions that are interrelated with or interdependent to the Federal action to determine if it would be reasonable to expect them to appreciably reduce listed species' likelihood of surviving and recovering in the wild by reducing their reproduction, numbers, or distribution (16 U.S.C. §1536; 50 CFR 402.02). Section 7 of the ESA and its implementing regulations also require biological and conference opinions to determine if Federal actions would destroy or adversely modify the conservation value of designated or proposed critical habitat (16 U.S.C. §1536).

NOAA Fisheries generally approaches "jeopardy" analyses in a series of steps. First, we evaluate the available evidence to identify the direct and indirect physical, chemical, and biotic effects of proposed actions on individual members of listed species or aspects of the species' environment (these effects include direct, physical harm or injury to individual members of a species; modifications to something in the species' environment - such as reducing a species' prey base, enhancing populations of predators, altering its spawning substrate, altering its ambient temperature regimes; or adding something novel to a species' environment - such as introducing exotic competitors or a sound). Once we have identified the effects of an action, we evaluate the available evidence to identify a species' probable response (including behavioral responses) to those effects to determine if those effects could reasonably be expected to reduce a species' reproduction, numbers, or distribution (for example, by changing birth, death, immigration, or emigration rates; increasing the age at which individuals reach sexual maturity; decreasing the age at which individuals stop reproducing; among others). We then use the evidence available to determine if these reductions, if there are any, could reasonably be expected to appreciably reduce a species' likelihood of surviving and recovering in the wild.

To evaluate the effects of the Tisdale Fish Screen Project, NOAA Fisheries examined proposed construction activities, operations and maintenance activities, habitat loss, and conservation measures, to identify likely impacts to listed anadromous salmonids within the action area based on the best available information.

The primary information used in this assessment includes fishery information previously described in the *Status of the Species* and *Environmental Baseline* sections of this biological and conference opinion; studies and accounts of the impacts of water diversions and in-river construction activities on anadromous species; and documents prepared in support of the proposed action, including the July 2004 ASIP (Reclamation 2004).

B. Assessment

The assessment will consider the nature, duration, and extent of the proposed action relative to the migration timing, behavior, and habitat requirements of federally-listed anadromous fish. Specifically, this assessment will consider construction impacts, operations and maintenance impacts, and impacts of habitat modification and loss associated with replacement of nearshore aquatic habitat with the fish screen structure and placement of riprap.

1. Construction Impacts

Potential construction impacts include entrainment and stranding of juvenile and adult salmon and steelhead behind cofferdams and into irrigation pumps; injury or death to juvenile and adult salmon and steelhead during fish rescue and relocation; exposure to noise and high sound pressure levels; exposure to increased turbidity, and impaired water quality; and loss of nearshore riverine habitat to the fish screen structure. The two potential construction sequences listed in the *Description of the Proposed Action* section of this biological and conference opinion (*i.e.*, either a duel or single cofferdam approach) will result in two different types of impacts. A single cofferdam approach will result the majority of construction-related impacts occurring during the first 60 to 90 days. A duel cofferdam approach will result in two separate periods of similar construction impacts.

a. *Entrainment, Stranding, and Fish Rescue*

Over the 24-month construction period, juvenile salmonids are likely to be entrained or stranded during construction from September through May of each construction year. First, juvenile salmonids may be entrained and stranded within the forebay area during cofferdam construction. Cofferdam construction between September and May would correspond with the migration periods of adult and juvenile winter- and CV spring-run Chinook salmon and CV steelhead. Adults are strong swimmers, and are likely to avoid construction-related disturbance during sheet pile driving, and avoid being entrained or stranded. Juvenile salmon and steelhead also demonstrate a startle or avoidance response to noise (Anderson 1990). However, since juveniles are weaker swimmers than adults, they may not be able to overcome ambient flow conditions and could become entrained and stranded. We anticipate that entrainment and stranding in cofferdams will be low because cofferdams will not be installed during high river flows that correspond with peak juvenile migration periods.

As the water level behind the cofferdam is drawn down to allow construction of the fish screen in the dry, salmon and steelhead will be rescued (*i.e.*, netted) and returned to the river according to the Fish Rescue Plan prepared for the project. The single cofferdam construction approach would require one fish rescue effort and the dual cofferdam approach would require two separate fish rescue efforts. Although salmonids recover well from capture, handling and short relocations, there may be incidental injury and death to individuals during the rescue. We expect that the rescue program will not capture and release every entrained juvenile. Results of a similar fish rescue operation behind the cofferdam installed during construction of the RD 108 Wilkins Slough fish screen showed that no salmonids were stranded, and fewer than 10 fish total were collected in the fish rescue. Since construction methods and schedules for Tisdale Fish Screen Project are similar to past construction of the RD 108 Wilkins Slough fish screen, and a similar fish rescue protocol will be applied when the cofferdams are closed, the loss of salmonids to stranding is expected to be low.

Second, diversions of water to meet irrigation needs and to minimize in-river turbidity would continue during the construction period. The cross-sectional area through which water will be diverted to the Tisdale Pumping Plant will be reduced to approximately 40 percent of the current area under both construction scenarios (*i.e.*, single or dual cofferdams). Intake velocities at any flow would be correspondingly higher than under current conditions. As a result, fish susceptibility to entrainment is anticipated to be higher than baseline entrainment for a period of about one year during construction. Entrained fish would enter the irrigation system and be permanently lost. The magnitude of this loss cannot be quantified given available data. The potential magnitude of increased risk of salmonid entrainment during construction would vary depending on the Tisdale Pumping Plant diversion schedule, the need to minimize in-river turbidity, the seasonal occurrence of juvenile salmonids migrating downstream within the Sacramento River, and the behavioral response of the juvenile fish to increased water velocities at the cofferdam. The risk of increased salmonid entrainment would be greater during the spring months, and would be highest for juvenile steelhead, during the spring diversion season (*e.g.*, March to June) coinciding with the latter portion of downstream juvenile migration. However, since the majority the juvenile salmonids migrate downstream during the late fall, winter and early spring months (*e.g.*, November through March) when diversion rates are typically low, the number of fish that are likely to be entrained is expected to be low.

b. *Sound Pressure Levels*

Installation of sheet pile and beams during construction of the cofferdam would be performed using a vibrating impact hammer. If the river bottom substrate does not allow installation using the vibrating technique, limited use of a percussion hammer would be required. The bottom substrate is expected to be soft based on results of core sampling at the site and similar substrate conditions encountered during installation of the cofferdam during construction of the RD 108 fish screen which is located within a few miles of the Tisdale Pumping Plant on the opposite side of the Sacramento River. Based on these conditions it is expected that a small percussion hammer would be required. If a percussion hammer is used for cofferdam installation, it will be on an intermittent and short duration basis (*i.e.*, hours or days). Both hammers would produce underwater sound pressure levels that may cause temporary disturbance within the Sacramento River and affect salmonid behavior and physiology through disruption of migration, feeding behavior, and potential increased exposure of juveniles to predation by forcing them from nearshore refugia.

The effect pile driving has on fish depends upon the pressure, measured in decibels (dB), of a sound or compression wave. Rassmusen (1967) found that immediate mortality of juvenile salmonids may occur at sound pressure levels exceeding 204 dB. Sustained sound pressures (four hours) in excess of 180 dB damaged the hair cells in the inner ear of cichlids (Hastings *et al.* 1996).

Feist *et al.* (1992) found that pile-driving in Puget Sound created sound within the range of salmonid hearing that could be detected at least 600 meters away. Abundance of juvenile salmon near pile driving rigs was reduced on days when the rigs were operating compared to non-operating days. McKinley and Patrick (1986) found that salmon smolts exposed to pulsed sound (similar to pile driving) demonstrated a startle or avoidance response, and Anderson (1990) observed a startle response in salmon smolts at the beginning of a pile driving episode but found that after a few poundings of the pilings fish were no longer startled. This suggests that pile driving or associated activity (*e.g.*, human movement, work boat operation, *etc.*) can cause avoidance of habitat in the immediate vicinity of the project site, but that fish also may become acclimated to the noise. If fish move into an area of higher predator concentration (*e.g.*, deeper water), they may experience increased susceptibility to predation and decreased survival. Fish that become acclimated may be exposed to additional project-related impacts.

At the City of Sacramento Water Treatment Plant Fish Screen Project, engineering analysis anticipated that the use of a smaller pile driving hammer that is similar in size to the largest hammer expected to be used at the proposed project, would generate sound pressure levels of 95 to 120 dB. Actual levels were not monitored. Because of the similarities in river depth, substrate sizes, and size of the pile driver at the City of Sacramento Water Treatment Plant Fish Screen Project and the proposed Project, maximum sound levels also should be similar, and below the 200 dB threshold known to cause internal tissue damage to fish. However, the levels may be high enough to affect adult and juvenile salmonids by startling fish and causing avoidance of habitats within 600 m of the noise source. This is a conservative estimate based on observations in Puget Sound and does not take into account specific on-site variables such as river flow and riverbank morphology that may reduce the actual distance.

NOAA Fisheries anticipates that pile driving will be detectable to salmonids up to 600 meters from the source, and that the sounds generated will harass juvenile salmon and steelhead by causing injury from temporary disruption of normal behaviors such as feeding, sheltering, and migrating that may contribute to reduced or negative growth. Disruption of these behaviors also may lead to increased predation if fish become disoriented or concentrated in areas with high predator densities. These effects should be small because pile driving will occur during the day, enabling unhindered fish passage at night during peak migration times. Additionally, given the limited and intermittent use of the hammers (*i.e.*, expected to be hours or days) the magnitude of potential adverse effects is expected to be low. Cofferdam installation also will avoid high river flow conditions, when peak juvenile migration is expected. Therefore, only a small portion of the listed ESUs should be affected.

d. *Turbidity and Suspended Sediment*

Cofferdam installation, dredging and site preparation will result in increased short-term, localized turbidity and suspended sediment concentrations within the Sacramento River. Exposure to increased turbidity, and suspended sediment may affect Sacramento River winter-run Chinook salmon, CV spring-run Chinook salmon, and CV steelhead through disruption of normal feeding and migration behavior, and expose juveniles to increased predation by forcing them from shallow water refugia into the open water of the river channel. The period of increased turbidity would be limited to pre-project dredging and installation of the cofferdams, which will require approximately 60 to 90 days. Increased turbidity and suspended sediments would occur intermittently during construction of the cofferdam.

Numerous studies show that suspended sediment and turbidity levels moderately elevated above natural background values can result in non-lethal detrimental effects to salmonids. Suspended sediment affects salmonids by decreasing reproductive success, reducing feeding success and growth, causing avoidance of rearing habitats, and disrupting migration cues (Bash *et al.* 2001). Sigler *et al.* (1984) in Bjornn and Reiser (1991), found that prolonged turbidity between 25 and 50 NTUs reduced growth of juvenile coho salmon and steelhead. Macdonald *et al.* (1991) found that the ability of salmon to find and capture food is impaired at turbidities from 25 to 70 NTUs. Bisson and Bilby (1982) reported that juvenile coho salmon avoid turbidities exceeding 70 NTUs. Increased sediment delivery can also fill interstitial substrate spaces and reduce cover for juvenile fish (Platts *et al.* 1979) and abundance and availability of aquatic invertebrates for food (Bjornn and Reiser 1991). We expect turbidity to affect Chinook salmon and steelhead in much the same way that it affects other salmonids, because of similar physiological and life history requirements between species.

Newcombe and Jensen (1996) believe that impacts on fish populations exposed to episodes of high suspended sediment may vary depending on the circumstance of the event. They also believe that wild fish may be less susceptible to direct and indirect effects of localized suspended sediment and turbidity increases because they are free to move elsewhere in the system and avoid sediment related effects. They emphasize that the severity of effects on salmonids depends not only on sediment concentration, but also on duration of exposure and the sensitivity of the affected life stage.

Suspended sediment from construction activities would increase turbidity at the project site and could continue downstream. Although Chinook salmon and steelhead are highly migratory and capable of moving freely throughout the action area, an increase in turbidity may injure juvenile salmonids by temporarily disrupting normal behaviors that are essential to growth and survival such as feeding, sheltering, and migrating. Injury is caused when disrupting these behaviors increases the likelihood that individual fish will face increased competition for food and space, and experience reduced growth rates or possibly weight loss.

The ASIP (Reclamation 2004) concludes that given the proposed conservation measure to minimize turbidity and suspended sediment, the project has the potential to locally increase ambient sediment concentrations during low flow periods from 20 to 27 milligrams per liter (mg/l), or by about 30 to 40 percent. At the higher range of anticipated flows, sediment concentrations would increase from 100 to 107 mg/l, or approximately seven percent. In either case, suspended sediment concentrations do not exceed the Regional Board Standard of 260 mg/l, and are well below levels measured in NTUs that cause sublethal effects to salmonids.

Project-related turbidity increases also may affect the sheltering ability of some juvenile salmon and steelhead and may cause injury or death by increasing their susceptibility to predation. The extent of these effects is expected to expect a small for several reasons. First, the highest turbidity levels will occur at the end of the seasonal juvenile migration period and only affect a small portion of each population. Second, the overall duration of the effect will be temporary, lasting approximately 60 to 90 days. Additionally, based on observations during similar construction activities in the Sacramento River, turbidity plumes are not expected to extend across the Sacramento River, but rather the plumes are expected to extend downstream from the site along the eastern side of the channel, affecting only a portion of the fish within the action area. Turbidity plumes may be as wide as 100 feet, and extend downstream for up to 1,000 feet. Once construction stops, water quality is expected to return to background levels within hours.

As a result of the limited timing and distribution of any sediment plumes generated during construction, salmon and steelhead will have the opportunity to avoid the plume during their upstream or downstream migration. Therefore turbidity-related effects that prevent successful upstream and downstream migration are not anticipated.

Operation of the pumping plant to the extent possible during cofferdam installation and site preparation would further reduce the potential concentration and areal extent of suspended sediments downstream of the site within the Sacramento River. As dredging or installation of sheet piling occurs, suspended sediments will be largely entrained into the water diverted into the service area distribution canals, thereby reducing potential adverse effects within the Sacramento

River. Adherence to erosion control measures and BMPs such as use of silt fences, straw bales and straw wattles will minimize the amount of project-related sediment and minimize the potential for post-construction turbidity changes.

e. *Other Water Quality*

Fuel spills or use of toxic compounds during project construction could release toxic contaminants into the Sacramento River and could injure or kill salmon and steelhead. NOAA Fisheries expects that adherence to BMPs that dictate the use, containment, and cleanup of contaminants will minimize the risk of introducing such products to the waterway because the prevention and contingency measures will require frequent equipment checks to prevent leaks, will keep stockpiled materials away from the water, and will require that absorbent booms are kept on-site to prevent petroleum products from entering the river in the event of a spill or leak. If BMPs are successfully implemented, NOAA Fisheries does not expect fuel spills or toxic compounds to cause injury or death to individual fish.

2. Operations and Maintenance Impacts

Operations and maintenance activities will be performed to maintain the design criteria of Tisdale Fish Screen. Operations and maintenance of the fish screen will reduce fish entrainment at the pumping facilities, but also may cause limited adverse effects to fish exposed to the structure, and maintenance operations. The facility would not increase water diversions from the Sacramento River and would, therefore, not affect baseline instream flows. The proposed fish screen project would not result in a change in the seasonal distribution of diversion operations.

The Tisdale Fish Screen Project is designed to meet DFG and NOAA Fisheries design criteria and would be maintained and operated to meet these criteria. Performance modelling found that the proposed screen meets design criteria under low (*i.e.*, 5,660 cfs), medium (*i.e.*, 9,460 cfs), and high (*i.e.*, 17,500 cfs) irrigation river flow conditions. Under these conditions operation of the fish screen would substantially reduce approach velocities to the Tisdale Pumping Plant, reducing the effects of the diversion on fish behavior and survival through modifications to local current patterns and water velocities in the vicinity of the intake. However, the potential does exist for fish to be injured or killed along the surface of the screen if the hydraulic conditions specified in the NOAA Fisheries design criteria are not met, or if river flows are not within the modeled range of conditions. The long-term operation of the fish screen will include inspection and maintenance practices developed to ensure that the fish screen operation are with the design specifications and meet NOAA Fisheries' criteria. Prior to each irrigation season, Sutter Mutual Water Company would inspect and repair the facility, as needed to meet criteria, and would maintain a stock of replacement screens that can be installed rapidly in case repair is needed. Juvenile fish are most likely to experience adverse effects from exposure to the fish screen during flow conditions that are below the modeled low flow of 5,660 cfs because approach and sweeping velocities may exceed NOAA Fisheries criteria. If criteria are exceeded, juveniles may be injured or killed by screen abrasion, screen impingement, or predation. River flows that are lower than 5,660 at the diversion point are relatively infrequent, occurring only in October, November, April, and May of critically dry years, and in May during dry years. Based on a review of flows in the Sacramento River at Wilkins Slough from 1901 to 1999, these conditions are expected to occur in less than fifteen percent of all years. Long-term operation is, therefore, expected to be reliable, periods of non-function should be brief, and juvenile survival is expected to be high.

Although the operation of the fish screen will reduce diversion-related entrainment, and increase fish survival through the action area, fish exposure to screens and associated features may affect some individuals through direct physical injury or by altering swimming behavior and causing an increased vulnerability to predation. The anticipated approach and sweeping velocities at the screen will prevent and minimize these effects. The fish screen also has been designed to have a smooth exterior surface and upstream and downstream transition areas that reduce or eliminate areas where juvenile salmonids are concentrated or disoriented to reduce the risk of predation, as well as to reduce or eliminate structural locations offering cover for predatory fish.

Maintenance actions such as dredging and screen replacement will be infrequent and occur in the enclosed fish screen forebay, not in the Sacramento River. Maintenance actions, therefore, are not expected to result in injury or death of individuals.

3. Habitat Impacts

Construction of the fish screen and placement of rock riprap will alter existing habitat conditions and result in a loss of habitat behind the fish screen. The area behind the fish screen will permanently exclude fish from the existing forebay and approximately 460 feet of existing nearshore aquatic habitat along the Sacramento River levee. The area where fish habitat exclusion will occur is approximately 0.5 acres. The placement of additional riprap along the base of the screen and upstream and downstream from the screen would impact the shoreline of the Sacramento River for a distance of approximately 610 feet.

Anadromous fish are present seasonally in the action area and the surrounding habitat is characterized as a narrow river channel confined by levees, stabilized with riprap, with a relatively deep, high velocity channel, no floodplains, and sparse riparian vegetation. Because of these habitat conditions, the action area does not provide favorable rearing conditions for salmon or steelhead, and primarily functions as a migration corridor. The area is not used as spawning habitat by salmonids. Because of the poor condition of excluded habitat, and projected high sweeping velocities through the action area, the impacts of habitat loss on juvenile growth should be small. The function of the action area as a migratory corridor will not be affected by the loss of habitat behind the fish screen.

The application of additional riprap may increase predator habitat availability, and increase predation rates throughout the action area. Predation studies indicate that juvenile salmon and steelhead also may be exposed to increased susceptibility to predation by native and introduced fish species along riprapped banks (Peters *et al.* 199; FWS 2000). Predatory fish in the lower Sacramento River have a broad tolerance of environmental conditions and are distributed throughout the action area. Potential predator species include Sacramento pikeminnow (*Ptychocheilus grandis*), inland silverside (*Menidia beryllina*), striped bass (*Morone saxatilis*), largemouth bass (*Micropterus salmoides*), and smallmouth bass (*M. dolomieui*). There are no available studies that quantify the predation of risk of salmon and steelhead along riprapped banks of the Sacramento River. However, studies on the Feather River (Cavallo *et al.* 2003), Sacramento River (Michny and Deibel 1986; Michny 1989) and in several other western states (Peters *et al.* 1998, and Tiffan *et al.* 2002) have shown lower salmonid rearing densities and higher predator densities along armored banks. The Corps (2004) also assumes that mortality is highest for juvenile fish along armored banks because they provide predator access, and lowest along natural banks with gravel and cobble sized materials because they exclude predators. Although predation is expected to increase with the additional application of riprap, the habitat modification will not be substantial, and any increase in the predation rate should be relatively small since the banks are already rocked. The application of additional rock is not expected to affect the overall suitability of nearshore habitat for rearing and migration.

VI. CUMULATIVE EFFECTS

Cumulative effects include the effects of future State, tribal, local, or private actions that are reasonably certain to occur in the action area considered in this biological and conference opinion. Future Federal actions that are unrelated to the proposed action are not considered in this section because they require separate consultation pursuant to section 7 of the ESA.

Ongoing agricultural activities likely will continue to cause entrainment into diversions, adversely affect water quality, fragment habitat availability and thus result in cumulative effects to listed Chinook salmon and steelhead.

VII. INTEGRATION AND SYNTHESIS

A. Impacts of the Proposed Action on Sacramento River Winter-run Chinook Salmon, Central Valley Spring-run Chinook Salmon, and Central Valley Steelhead, and their Habitat

NOAA Fisheries finds that the proposed action will affect Sacramento River winter-run Chinook salmon, CV spring-run Chinook salmon, and CV steelhead, through construction-related impacts, operations, and habitat modification and loss at the project site. Construction-related impacts are expected to begin during May 2005, and last for 24 months. Construction activities may cause entrainment and stranding in irrigation pumps and cofferdams. Cofferdam construction and rock placement will cause temporary increases in sound pressure levels and turbidity that may injure or kill juveniles by causing reduced growth and increased susceptibility to predation. Initial rock placement is expected to result in temporary disruptions in the feeding, sheltering, and migratory behavior of adult and juvenile salmon and steelhead. This disruption may injure or kill juveniles by causing reduced growth and increased susceptibility to predation.

Construction impacts will be greatest during the 60 to 90 day cofferdam installation period due to the potential overlap between the proposed cofferdam installation, and dredging period, and the migration of adult and juvenile salmon and steelhead during winter and spring months. A single cofferdam approach will result the majority of construction-related impacts occurring during the first 60 to 90 days. A duel cofferdam approach will result in two separate periods of similar construction impacts. Juveniles are expected to be affected most significantly because of their small size, reliance on nearshore aquatic habitat, and vulnerability to factors that affect their growth, and distribution. Adults should not be injured because their size, preference for deep water, and crepuscular migratory behavior enable them to avoid construction-related impacts. Although juveniles exhibit crepuscular behavior because of their higher use of near-shore aquatic habitats, they are more susceptible to impacts daytime construction activities. Construction impacts following the 60 to 90 cofferdam installation period should be small to negligible because most work will be performed behind cofferdams, and other in-channel work will avoid peak juvenile outmigration and adult upstream migration periods.

Turbidity-related injury and predation will be minimized by implementing the proposed conservation measures such as implementation of BMPs, operation of irrigation pumps, and adherence to Regional Board water quality standards. Adherence to BMPs is expected to prevent fuel spills and release of other toxic compounds from causing injury or death to individuals. The Fish Rescue Program will minimize the mortality of fish that are entrained or stranded within cofferdams.

Operations and maintenance actions will occur annually for the lifespan of the project. Conservation measures and integrated design features are expected to minimize or avoid adverse operations and maintenance effects by maintaining the fish screen to NOAA Fisheries criteria, and avoiding peak migration periods during maintenance activities. Near-screen conditions generally are expected to be favorable for survival, and injury and death rates should be low. However, because of the size of the screen, hydraulic uniformity across the surface is not likely to be constant, and small localized areas of high approach velocities or low sweeping velocities could result in juvenile impingement of the screen face. We anticipate that these conditions will be infrequent (*i.e.*, less than 15 percent of years), and most likely to occur when Sacramento River flows are below the 5,660 low flow conditions that was modeled during initial project design. Maintenance and inspection activities such are expected to minimize this occurrence. Maintenance actions such as dredging and screen replacement will be infrequent and occur in the enclosed fish screen forebay, not in the Sacramento River. Maintenance actions, therefore, are not expected to result in injury or death of individuals.

Overall, NOAA Fisheries expects that the operation of the Tisdale Fish Screen will significantly reduce juvenile Chinook salmon and steelhead entrainment, injury, and mortality from current baseline conditions.

B. Impacts of the Proposed Action on ESU Survival and Recovery

The adverse effects to Sacramento River winter-run Chinook salmon, CV spring-run Chinook salmon, and CV steelhead within the action area are not expected to affect the overall survival and recovery of the ESUs. This is largely due to the fact that construction impacts will be temporary, and will be minimized through the implementation of the proposed conservation measures. Construction-related impacts will not impede adult fish from reaching upstream spawning and holding habitat, or juvenile fish from migrating to downstream rearing areas. The number of individuals actually injured or killed is expected to be small compared to the sizes of the respective salmonid populations; therefore, adverse population-level impacts are not anticipated.

The long-term operation of the fish screen will substantially reduce entrainment and related mortality of juvenile Chinook salmon and steelhead. Because construction impacts are expected to be temporary and avoid peak migration periods, and because the screening of the Tisdale Pumping Plant will reduce entrainment and increase juvenile survival in the Sacramento River, the proposed action is not expected to adversely affect the continued existence of Sacramento River winter-run Chinook salmon, CV spring-run Chinook salmon, and CV steelhead within the action area.

C. Impacts of the Proposed Action on Designated and Proposed Critical Habitat

Impacts to the designated critical habitat of Sacramento River winter-run Chinook salmon, and the proposed critical habitat of CV spring-run Chinook salmon and CV steelhead include the permanent loss of approximately 460 linear feet, and 0.5 acres of existing nearshore aquatic habitat) along the Sacramento River levee. The placement of additional riprap along the base of the screen and upstream and downstream from the screen would impact the shoreline of the Sacramento River for a distance of approximately 610 feet. Habitat elements within the action area, such as large woody debris, SRA, shoreline habitat complexity, and refugia, currently are degraded, fragmented and do not contribute beneficially to the conservation value of designated and proposed critical habitat. Although the proposed action will maintain these degraded and fragmented habitat condition, the proposed habitat modifications and loss, are relatively small and similar to existing site conditions. Therefore, we do not expect project-related impacts to result in an adverse change to the conservation value of designated and proposed critical habitat.

VIII. CONCLUSION

After reviewing the best available scientific and commercial information, the current status of Sacramento River winter-run Chinook salmon, Central Valley spring-run Chinook salmon, Central Valley steelhead, the environmental baseline for the action area, the effects of the proposed action, and the cumulative effects, it is NOAA Fisheries' biological opinion that the Tisdale Fish Screen Project, as proposed, is not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of Sacramento River winter-run Chinook salmon, Central Valley spring-run Chinook salmon, or Central Valley steelhead, and is not likely to destroy or adversely modify the designated critical habitat Sacramento River winter-run Chinook salmon.

After reviewing the best available scientific and commercial information, the current status of proposed critical habitat for Central Valley spring-run Chinook salmon and Central Valley steelhead, the environmental baseline for the action area, the effects of the proposed action, and the cumulative effects, it is NOAA Fisheries' conference opinion that the Tisdale Fish Screen Project, as proposed, is not likely to destroy or adversely modify the proposed critical habitat Central Valley spring-run Chinook salmon and Central Valley steelhead.

IX. INCIDENTAL TAKE STATEMENT

Section 9 of the Act and Federal regulation pursuant to section 4(d) of the Act prohibit the take of endangered and threatened species, respectively, without special exemption. Take is defined as to harass, harm, pursue, hunt, shoot, wound, kill, trap, capture or collect, or to attempt to engage in any such conduct. Harm is further defined by NOAA Fisheries as an act which kills or injures fish or wildlife. Such an act may include significant habitat modification or degradation where it actually kills or injures fish or wildlife by significantly impairing essential behavioral patterns, including breeding, spawning, rearing, migrating, feeding or sheltering. Incidental take is defined as take that is incidental to, and not the purpose of, the carrying out of an otherwise lawful activity. Under the terms of section 7(b)(4) and section 7(o)(2), taking that is incidental to and not the purpose of the agency action is not considered to be prohibited taking under the Act provided that such taking is in compliance with the terms and conditions of this Incidental Take Statement.

The measures described below are non-discretionary, and must be undertaken by Reclamation so that they become binding conditions of any grant or permit, as appropriate, for the exemption in section 7(o)(2) to apply. Reclamation has a continuing duty to regulate the activity covered by this incidental take statement. If Reclamation (1) fails to assume and implement the terms and conditions or (2) fails to require the contractors to adhere to the terms and conditions of the incidental take statement through enforceable terms that are added to the permit or grant document, the protective coverage of section 7(o)(2) may lapse. In order to monitor the impact of incidental take, Reclamation must report the progress of the action and its impact on the species to NOAA Fisheries as specified in the incidental take statement (50 CFR §402.14(i)(3)).

A. Amount or Extent of Take

NOAA Fisheries anticipates incidental take of Sacramento River winter-run Chinook salmon, CV steelhead, and CV spring-run Chinook salmon, through construction-related impacts, operations and maintenance impacts and habitat modification and loss at the project site. Specifically, NOAA Fisheries anticipates that juvenile listed salmonids may be killed, injured, or harassed during construction and operations and maintenance activities. NOAA Fisheries does not anticipate take of adults.

NOAA Fisheries cannot, using the best available information, quantify the anticipated incidental take of individual Sacramento River winter Chinook salmon, CV spring-run Chinook salmon and CV steelhead because of the variability and uncertainty associated with the population size of each species, annual variations in the timing of migration, and uncertainties regarding individual habitat use of the project area. However, it is possible to describe the conditions that will lead to the take.

Accordingly, NOAA Fisheries is quantifying take of Sacramento River winter-run Chinook salmon, CV spring-run Chinook salmon, and CV steelhead incidental to the Tisdale Fish Screen Project in terms associated with the extent and duration of construction activities, operations and maintenance activities, and as the extent of habitat loss or modification. Although the exact percentage of each ESU that will be affected cannot be determined, because of the size of the project, and the brief exposure time that fish will face, a small, unknown percentage of each population, will be harmed, injured, or killed.

It is anticipated that construction-related take will be in the form of injury and death from entrainment, stranding, fish rescue efforts, predation, and in-water placement of rock. Construction-related take is expected for 24 months. Construction-related take is not expected to exceed that associated with construction activities between May 2005, and May 2007. The following level of incidental take from project activities is anticipated:

1. All rearing or migrating juvenile winter- and spring-run Chinook salmon and steelhead injured or killed from pumping-related entrainment during the 24 month construction period. Injury and death from pumping-related entrainment will occur from November through May of each construction season.

2. All rearing or migrating juvenile winter- and spring-run Chinook salmon and steelhead injured or killed during construction from cofferdam installation and closure. Take in the form of injury and death from cofferdam installation from pile driving is not expected to exceed a total of 90 days. Take is expected from pile driving that occurs between November and May of each construction year, within 600 meters of the source at levels below 200 dB.

Take in the form of injury and death is expected from turbidity levels within the Regional Board standards listed in the *Description of the Proposed Action* section, between November and May of each construction year, extending downstream for up to 600 meters.

Take in the form of capture, injury and death is expected from fish rescue efforts that will occur within enclosed cofferdams between November and May of each construction year. Death from fish rescue efforts is not expected to exceed ten percent.

3. All rearing or migrating juvenile winter- and spring-run Chinook salmon and steelhead injured or killed from project operation. Operations-related take is expected in the form of injury and death of juveniles from exposure to the fish screen and associated in-river project features. Specifically, operations-related incidental take is expected if pumping occurs when Sacramento River flows at the project site are below 5,660 cfs. This is expected to occur during October, November, April, and May of critically dry years, and during May of dry years.

4. All rearing or migrating juvenile winter- and spring-run Chinook salmon and steelhead injured or killed from placement of rock rip-rap or harmed by permanent habitat loss and modification. NOAA Fisheries estimates that construction of the fish screen will amount to the permanent loss of up to 460 linear feet, and 0.5 acres of existing nearshore aquatic habitat, and the modification of up to approximately 610 feet shoreline habitat.

Anticipated incidental take may be exceeded if project activities exceed the criteria described above, if the project is not implemented as described in the ASIP for the Tisdale Fish Screen Project (Reclamation 2004), or if the project is not implemented in compliance with the terms and conditions of this incidental take statement.

B. Effect of the Take

NOAA Fisheries has determined that the above level of take is not likely to jeopardize Sacramento River winter-run Chinook salmon, Central Valley steelhead, or Central Valley spring-run Chinook salmon. The effect of this action will consist of fish behavior modification, loss of habitat value, and potential death or injury of juvenile Sacramento River winter-run Chinook salmon, Central Valley steelhead, or Central Valley spring-run Chinook salmon.

C. Reasonable and Prudent Measures

NOAA Fisheries has determined that the following reasonable and prudent measures (RPMs) are necessary and appropriate to minimize the incidental take of listed anadromous salmonids.

1. Measures shall be taken to minimize injury and mortality from project construction, operations, and maintenance.

2. Measures shall be taken to maintain, monitor, and adaptively manage all conservation measures throughout the life of the project to ensure their effectiveness.

3. Measures shall be taken to minimize the effect of habitat modifications at the project site.

D. Terms and Conditions

In order to be exempt from the prohibitions of section 9 of the Act, Reclamation must comply with the following terms and conditions, which implement the reasonable and prudent measures described above and outline required reporting/monitoring requirements. These terms and conditions are non-discretionary.

1. Measures shall be taken to minimize injury and mortality from project construction, operations, and maintenance.

    a. Reclamation shall require Sutter Mutual Water Company and its contractors to use low-flow pumps with screened intakes during cofferdam dewatering activities.

    b. Reclamation shall require Sutter Mutual Water Company and its contractors to conduct fish rescue activities consistent with NOAA Fisheries Electrofishing Guidelines (NOAA Fisheries 2000).

    c. Reclamation shall ensure that when Sacramento River flows are less than 5,660 cfs, project operations are conducted in a manner that maintains consistency with NOAA Fisheries' fish screen design criteria.

2. Measures shall be taken to maintain, monitor, and adaptively manage all conservation measures throughout the life of the project to ensure their effectiveness.

    a. Reclamation shall provide a project summary and compliance report to NOAA Fisheries within 60 days of completion of the proposed action. This report shall describe construction dates, implementation of project conservation measures, compliance monitoring, and the terms and conditions of the biological opinion; observed or other known effects on the Sacramento River winter-run Chinook salmon, if any; and any occurrences of incidental take of the Sacramento River winter-run Chinook salmon, CV steelhead, and CV spring-run Chinook salmon.

b. Reclamation shall provide a detailed operations and maintenance plan within one year of completion of the proposed action.

c. Reclamation shall provide a detailed compliance report demonstrating the success of meeting NOAA Fisheries' fish screen criteria for periods when river flow conditions drop below 5,660 cfs during project operations in the months of September through May.

3. Measures shall be taken to minimize the effect of habitat modifications at the project site.

a. Reclamation shall require Sutter Mutual Water Company to use the smallest size of rock riprap as practicable to maintain bank stability and fish screen performance, while minimizing habitat modifications that will increase predator habitat.

b. Reclamation shall require Sutter Mutual to replace riparian vegetation that is lost or damaged to construction at a three to one ratio, calculated on an acreage basis. Replacement vegetation shall consist of native plant species appropriate for the area.

Reports and notifications required by these terms and conditions shall be submitted to:

Sacramento Area Office
National Marine Fisheries Service
650 Capitol Mall, Suite 8-300
Sacramento California 95814-4706
FAX: (916) 930-3629
Phone: (916) 930-3600

X. CONSERVATION RECOMMENDATIONS

Section 7(a)(1) of the ESA directs Federal agencies to utilize their authorities to further the purposes of the ESA by carrying out conservation programs for the benefit of endangered and threatened species. These conservation recommendations include discretionary measures that Reclamation can implement to avoid or minimize adverse effects of a proposed action on a listed species or critical habitat or regarding the development of information. NOAA Fisheries provides the following conservation recommendations that would avoid or reduce adverse impacts to listed salmonids:

1. Measures should be taken to evaluate and minimize injury and mortality at other diversion points along the Sacramento River that are owned and operated by the Sutter Mutual Water Company, including the State Ranch Bend Pumping Plant (128 cfs capacity), and the Portugese Bend Pumping Plant (106 cfs capacity).

2. Sutter Mutual should monitor entrainment at the State Ranch Bend and Portugese Bend Pumping Plants, and coordinate with the Anadromous Fish Screen Program to identify the priority of screening these facilities.

3. Reclamation should encourage bank protection efforts using biotechnical approaches, which may then preclude the need for rock fill and/or rock riprap to achieve engineering goals.

4. Reclamation should implement biotechnical measures in place of traditional revetment techniques should any of the riprap begin to cause scour and require additional bank stabilization.

5. Reclamation should conduct or fund studies to help quantify fish losses at water diversion, and prioritize fish screen projects for future funding.

6. Reclamation should continue to work cooperatively with other State and Federal agencies, private landowners, governments, and local watershed groups to identify opportunities for cooperative analysis and funding to support salmonid habitat restoration projects within the lower Sacramento River.

To be kept informed of actions minimizing or avoiding adverse effects, or benefitting listed and proposed species or their habitats, NOAA Fisheries requests notification of the implementation of any conservation recommendations.

XI. REINITIATION OF CONSULTATION

This concludes formal consultation on the proposed Tisdale Fish Screen Project. Reinitiation of formal consultation is required if 1) the amount or extent of taking specified in any incidental take statement is exceeded, 2) new information reveals effects of the action that may affect listed species or critical habitat in a manner or to an extent not previously considered, 3) the action, including the avoidance, minimization and compensation measures listed in the *Description of the Proposed Action* section is subsequently modified in a manner that causes an effect to the listed species that was not considered in the biological opinion, or 4) a new species is listed or critical habitat is designated that may be affected by the action. In instances where the amount or extent of incidental take is exceeded, formal consultation shall be reinitiated immediately.

You may request NOAA Fisheries to confirm the conference opinion as a biological opinion if the proposed critical habitat designations become final. The request must be in writing. If NOAA Fisheries reviews the proposed action and finds that there have been no significant changes to the action or in the information used during the conference, NOAA Fisheries will confirm the conference opinion as the biological opinion on the project, and no further section 7 consultation will be necessary.

XII. LITERATURE CITED

Anderson, J. J. 1990. Assessment of the risk of pile driving to juvenile fish; presented to the Deep Foundations Institute. Fisheries Research Institute, University of Washington.

Ayers and Associates, 2001. Two-dimensional modeling and analysis of spawning bed mobilization, lower American River. Prepared for U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Sacramento District Office.

Bailey, E.D. 1954. Time pattern of 1953-1954 migration of salmon and steelhead into the upper Sacramento River. California Department of Fish and Game, unpublished report.

Barnhart, R.A. 1986. Species Profiles: life histories and environmental requirements of coastal fishes and invertebrates (Pacific Southwest), steelhead. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Biological Report 82(11.60).

Bash, J., C. Berman, and S. Bolton. 2001. Effects of turbidity and suspended solids on salmonids. Center for Streamside Studies, University of Washington.

Beamer, E. M., and R. A. Henderson. 1998. Juvenile salmonid use of natural and hydromodified stream bank habitat in the mainstem Skagit River, northwest Washington. Skagit System Cooperative, LaConner, Washington.

Bell, M.C. 1991. Fisheries Handbook of Engineering Requirements and Biological Criteria (third edition). U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Portland, Oregon.

Bilby R.E. 1984. Removal of woody debris may affect stream channel stability. Journal of Forestry 82:609-613.

Bisson, P. B. and R. E. Bilby. 1982. Avoidance of suspended sediment by juvenile coho salmon. North American Journal of Fisheries Management. 2:371-374.

Bjornn T.C. and D.W. Reiser. 1991. Habitat requirements of salmonids in streams. American Fisheries Society Special Publication 19:83-138.

Boles, G.L., S.M. Turek, C.C. Maxwell, and D.M. McGill. 1988. Water temperature effects on Chinook salmon (*Oncorhynchus tshawytscha*) with emphasis on the Sacramento River: a literature review. California Department of Water Resources.

Bureau of Reclamation and Orange Cove Irrigation District. 1999. Draft Environmental Assessment/Initial Study for Mill Creek Anadromous Fish Adaptive Management Enhancement Plan. August 1999.

Bureau of Reclamation. 2004. Action Specific Implementation Plan for the Sutter Mutual Water Company Tisdale Pumping Plant Positive Barrier Fish Screen Project. July 2004. Sacramento, California.

Busby, P.J., T.C. Wainwright, G.J. Bryant, L. Lierheimer, R.S. Waples, F.W. Waknitz and I.V. Lagomarsino. 1996. Status review of west coast steelhead from Washington, Idaho, Oregon and California. U.S. Department of Commerce. NOAA Technical Memo. NMFS-NWFSC-27.

California Advisory Committee on Salmon and Steelhead. 1988. Restoring the balance. California Department of Fish and Game, Sacramento, California.

California Bay-Delta Program. 1999. Ecosystem Restoration Program Plan, Volume II. Technical Appendix to draft PEIS/EIR. June 1999.

California Department of Fish and Game. 1965. California Fish and Wildlife Plan.

California Department of Fish and Game. 1998. A report to the Fish and Game Commission: A status review of the spring-run Chinook (*Oncorhynchus tshawytscha*) in the Sacramento River drainage. Candidate Species Status Report 98-01. June 1998.

California Department of Fish and Game. 2000a. 1999 Upper Sacramento River Winter-Run Chinook Salmon Escapement Survey. May - August 1999. Habitat Conservation Division Stream Evaluation Program Technical Report No.00-1. January 2000.

California Department of Fish and Game. 2000b. Spring-run Chinook Salmon. Annual Report prepared for the Fish and Game Commission. Habitat Conservation Division Native Anadromous Fish and Watershed Branch. June 2000.

California Department of Fish and Game. 2001. Sacramento River Winter-run Chinook Salmon, Biennial Report 2000-2001, Prepared for the Fish and Game Commission.

California Department of Fish and Game. 2002. Sacramento river winter-run Chinook salmon biennial report, 2000-2001. Prepared for the Fish and Game Commission. California Department of Fish and Game, Habitat Conservation Division, Native Anadromous Fish and Watershed Branch.

California Department of Fish and Game. 2003. Preliminary unpublished data: Adult Chinook salmon populations in the Sacramento/San Joaquin River systems. Native Anadromous Fish and Watershed Branch. Sacramento, California.

California Department of Fish and Game. 2002. Sacramento river winter-run Chinook salmon biennial report, 2000-2001. Prepared for the Fish and Game Commission. California

Department of Fish and Game, Habitat Conservation Division, Native Anadromous Fish and Watershed Branch.

California Department of Fish and Game. 2004. Freshwater Sport Fishing Regulations 2004-2006. California Fish and Commission and Department of Fish and Game, Sacramento, California.

California Department of Water Resources. 1994. Sacramento River bank erosion investigation. Progress Report, California Department of Water Resources, Redding, California.

California Resources Agency. 1989. Upper Sacramento River Fisheries and Riparian Management Plan. Prepared by an Advisory Council established by SB1086, authored by State Senator Jim Nielson.

Campbell, E.A. and P. B. Moyle. 1992. Effects of temperature, flow, and disturbance on adult spring-run Chinook salmon. University of California. Water Resources Center. Technical Completion Report.

Cavallo, B., R. Kurth, J. Kindopp, A. Seeholtz, and M. Perrone. 2003. Distribution and habitat use of steelhead and other fishes in the lower Feather River, 1999-2001. Interim report prepared by the California Department of Water Resources. January 22, 2003.

Clark, G. H. 1929. Sacramento-San Joaquin salmon (Oncorhynchus tshawytscha) fishery of California. California Fish and Game Bulletin 17:73.

Cramer, S.P. and D.B. Demko. 1997. The status of late fall and spring Chinook salmon in the Sacramento River Basin regarding the Endangered Species Act. S.P. Cramer and Associates. Sacramento, California.

Cordone, A.J. and D.W. Kelley. 1961. The influences of inorganic sediment on the aquatic life of streams. California Department of Fish Game 47:189-228.

Decato, R.J. 1978. Evaluation of the Glenn-Colusa Irrigation District Fish Screen. California Department of Fish and Game, Anadromous Fish Branch Administrative Report No. 78-20.

Edwards, G.W., K.A.F. Urquhart, and T.L. Tillman. 1996. Adult salmon migration monitoring, Suisun Marsh Salinity Control Gates, September-November 1994. Technical Report 50. Interagency Ecological Program for the San Francisco Bay/Delta Estuary.

Emmett, R.L., S.L. Stone, S.A. Hinton, and M.E. Monaco. 1991. Distribution and abundance of fishes and invertebrates in West coast estuaries, Volume II: Species life history summaries. ELMR Report No. 8. NOAA/NOS Strategic Environmental Assessments Division, Rockville, Maryland.

Feist, B.E., J. J. Anderson and R. Miyamoto. 1992. Potential impacts of pile driving on juvenile pink (*Oncorhynchus gorbuscha*) and chum (*O. keta*) salmon behavior and distribution. FRI-UW-9603. Fisheries Resources Institute, University of Washington, Seattle.

Fisher, F.W. 1994. Past and Present Status of Central Valley Chinook Salmon. Conservation Biology 8:870-873.

Garcia, A. 1989. The impacts of squawfish predation on juvenile Chinook salmon at Red Bluff Diversion Dam and other locations in the Sacramento River. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Report No. AFF/FAO

Gingras, M. 1997. Mark/recapture experiments at Clifton Court Forebay to estimate pre-screen loss of juvenile fishes: 1976-1993. Interagency Ecological Program Technical Report No. 55.

Goals Project. 1999. Baylands Ecosystem Habitat Goals: A report of habitat recommendations prepared by the San Francisco Bay Area Wetlands Ecosystem Goals Project. A report of habitat recommendations prepared by the San Francisco Bay Area Wetlands Ecosystem Goals Project. USEPA, San Francisco. San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board, Oakland, California.

Hallock, R.J., and W.F. Van Woert. October 1959. A Survey of Anadromous Fish Losses in Irrigation Diversions from the Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers. California Fish and Game 45:227-266.

Hallock, R.J. D.H. Fry, and D.A. LaFaunce. 1957. The use of wire fyke traps to estimate the runs of adult salmon and steelhead in the Sacramento River. California Fish and Game 43:271-298.

Hallock, R.J., W.F. Van Woert, and L. Shapovalov. 1961. An evaluation of stocking hatchery rearer steelhead rainbow (*Salmo gairdnerii gairdnerii*) in the Sacramento River system. California Department of Fish and Game Bulletin 114.

Hallock, R.J. and F. Fisher. 1985. Status of winter-run Chinook salmon, *Oncorhynchus tshawytscha*, in the Sacramento River. California Department of Fish and Game, Anadromous Fisheries Branch Office Report, January 25, 1985.

Hallock, R.J. and W.F. Van Woert. 1959. A survey of fish losses in irrigation diversions from the Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers. California Department of Fish and Game, Inland Fisheries Branch. Vol. 45 No. 4.

Hanson, C.H. 1996. Guidance efficiency of an acoustic (low-frequency sound) barrier in reducing juvenile Chinook salmon entrainment at the Reclamation District 1004 Princeton Slough Diversion: 1995 field studies and evaluation. Prepared for Reclamation District 1004. Hanson Environmental, Inc.

Hanson and Bemis. B. J. 1997. Results of the 1996 juvenile winter-run Chinook salmon incidental take monitoring at Reclamation District 1004. Prepared for Reclamation District 1004. Hanson Environmental, Inc.

Hanson, C.H. 2001. Assessment of potential fisheries benefits of providing positive barrier fish screens at the Sutter Mutual Water Company Tisdale, State Ranch Bend and Portugese Bend pumping plants. Prepared for Sutter Mutual Water Company. Hanson Environmental, Inc.

Hartman, G., J.C. Scrivener, L.B. Holtby, and L. Powell. 1987. Some effects of different streamside treatments on physical conditions and fish population processes in Carnation Creek, a coastal rainforest stream in British Columbia. Pages 330-372 *in* Salo and Cundy (1987).

Harvey, C.D. 1995. Adult steelhead counts in Mill and Deer creeks, Tehama County, October 1993 - June 1994. California Department of Fish and Game. Inland Fisheries Administrative Report. No. 95-3.

Hastings, M. C., Popper, A. N., Finneran, J. J., and Lanford, P. 1996. Effects of low frequency sound on hair cells of the inner ear and lateral line of the teleost fish *Astronotus ocellatus*, Journal of the Acoustical Society of America 99: 1759-1766.

Herren, J.R. and S.S. Kawasaki. 2001. Inventory of water diversions in four geographic areas in California's Central Valley. Pages 343-355, *in*: R.L. Brown, editor. Contributions to the biology of Central Valley salmonids. Volume. 2. California Fish and Game. Fish Bulletin 179.

Interagency Ecological Program Steelhead Project Work Team. 1999. Monitoring, Assessment, and Research on Central Valley Steelhead: Status of Knowledge, Review Existing Programs, and Assessment Needs. *in*: Comprehensive Monitoring, Assessment, and Research Program Plan, Technical Appendix VII-11.

Jones and Stokes Associates, Inc. 1993. Strategies, potential sites, and site evaluation criteria for restoration of Sacramento River fish and wildlife habitats, Red Bluff to the Feather River. Prepared for the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Sacramento, California.

Keller, E.A., and F.J. Swanson. 1979. Effects of large organic material on channel form and fluvial processes. Earth Surface Processes 4:361-380.

Kjelson, M.A., P.F. Raquel, and F.W. Fisher. 1982. Life history of fall-run juvenile Chinook salmon, *Oncorhynchus tshawytscha,* in the Sacramento-San Joaquin estuary, California, pages 393-411 *in* V.S. Kennedy, editor. Estuarine comparisons. Academic Press, New York, New York.

MacDonald, Lee H., Alan W. Smart, and Robert C. Wissmar. 1991. Monitoring guidelines to evaluate effects of forestry activities on streams in the Pacific Northwest and Alaska. EPA Region 10 and University of Washington Center for Streamside Studies, Seattle.

Martin, C.D., P.D. Gaines, and R.R. Johnson. 2001. Estimating the abundance of Sacramento River juvenile winter Chinook salmon with comparisons to adult escapement. Red Bluff Research Pumping Plant Report Series, Volume 5. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Red Bluff, California.

McCain, M. 1992. Comparison of habitat use and availability for juvenile fall Chinook salmon in a tributary of the Smith River, CA. FHR Currents, R-5 Fish Habitat Relationship Technical Bulletin, USDA Forest Service, Pacific Southwest Region 7:1-9.

McEwan, D.R., and T. Jackson. 1996. Steelhead Restoration and Management Plan for California. California Department of Fish and Game, February 1996.

McEwan, D.R. 2001. Central Valley Steelhead. Contributions to the biology of Central Valley salmonids. R. Brown editor. California Department of Fish and Game Fish Bulletin No. 179.

McGill, R.R. Jr. 1987. Land use changes in the Sacramento River riparian zone, Redding to Colusa. A third update: 1982-1987. Department of Water Resources, Northern District.

McKinley, R.S., and P.H. Patrick. 1986. Use of behavioral stimuli to divert sockeye salmon smolts at the Seton Hydro-electric station, British Columbia. *in*: W.C. Micheletti, ed. 1987. Proceedings of the Electric Power Research Institute at steam and hydro plants. San Francisco, California.

Meehan W.R. and T.C. Bjornn. 1991. Salmonid distribution and life histories. American Fisheries Society Special Publication 19:47-82.

Michny, F., and M. Hampton. 1984. Sacramento River Chico Landing to Red Bluff Project, 1984 juvenile salmon study. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Division of Ecological Services, Sacramento, California.

Michny, F.J. 1989. Concluding report, evaluation of palisade bank stabilization, Woodson Bridge, Sacramento River, California. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Sacramento.

Michny, F.J. and Deibel, R. 1986. Sacramento River, Chico Landing to Red Bluff Project, 1985 juvenile salmon study. US Fish and Wildlife Service, Sacramento, California.

Moore, T.L. 2001. Steelhead Survey Report for Antelope, Deer, Beegum and Mill Creeks 2001. California Department of Fish and Game Sacramento River Salmon and Steelhead Assessment Program.

Moyle, P. B. 1976. Inland fishes of California. University of California Press, Berkeley.

Moyle, P.B., J.E. Williams, and E.D. Wikramanayake. 1989. Fish species of special concern of California. Wildlife and Fisheries Biology Department, University of California, Davis. Prepared for The Resources Agency, California Department of Fish and Game, Rancho Cordova.

Myers, J.M., R.G. Kope, G.J. Bryant, D. Teel, L.J. Lierheimer, T.C. Wainwright, W.S. Grant, F.W. Waknitz, K. Neely, S.T. Lindley, and R.S. Waples. 1998. Status review of Chinook salmon from Washington, Idaho, Oregon, and California. U.S. Department of Commerce, NOAA Technical Memo. NMFS-NWFSC-35. 443 pages.

National Marine Fisheries Service. 1993. Biological Opinion addressing the effects of the operation of the Central Valley Project and the State Water Project on Sacramento River winter-run Chinook salmon. Pacific Southwest Region.

National Marine Fisheries Service. 1996. Factors for steelhead decline: a supplement to the notice of determination for west coast steelhead under the Endangered Species Act. NOAA Fisheries Protected Species Branch (Portland, Oregon) and Protected Species Management Division, Long Beach, California.

National Marine Fisheries Service. 1997. NMFS Proposed Recovery Plan for the Sacramento River Winter-run Chinook Salmon. National Marine Fisheries Service Southwest Region, Long Beach, California. August 1997.

National Marine Fisheries Service. 1998. Status Review of Chinook Salmon from Washington, Idaho, Oregon, and California. US Dept. of Commerce, NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-NWFSC.

National Marine Fisheries Service. 2000. Guidelines for electrofishing water containing salmonids listed under the Endangered Species Act. http://www.nwr.noaa.gov/1salmon/salmesa/4ddocs/final4d/electro2000.pdf.

National Marine Fisheries Service. 2001. Biological Opinion for the Sacramento River Bank Protection Project, Contracts 42E and 42F. National Marine Fisheries Service Southwest Region, Long Beach, California. September 2001.

National Marine Fisheries Service. 2003. Preliminary conclusions regarding the updated status of listed ESUs of West Coast salmon and steelhead. West Coast Salmon Biological Review Team. U.S. Deptartment of Commerce, NOAA Tech. NMFS-NWFSC. Draft Report February 2003.

National Research Council. 1996. Upstream salmon and society in the Pacific Northwest. National Research Council funded report. National Academy Press, Washington D.C.

Newcombe, C.P., and J.O.T. Jensen. 1996. Channel suspended sediment and fisheries: a synthesis for quantitative assessment of risk and impact. North American Journal of Fisheries Management 16:693-727.

Nobriga, M., and P. Cadrett. 2003. Differences among hatchery and wild steelhead: evidence from Delta fish monitoring programs. Interagency Ecological Program for the San Francisco Estuary Newsletter 14:30-38.

Orsi, J. 1967. Predation Study Report, 1966-1967. California Department of Fish and Game.

Phillips, R.W. and H.J. Campbell. 1961. The embryonic survival of coho salmon and steelhead trout as influenced by some environmental conditions in gravel beds. Annual Report to Pacific Marine Fisheries Commission 14:60-73.

Peters, R.J., B.R. Missildine, and D.L. Low. 1998. Seasonal fish densities near river banks stabilized with various stabilization methods. First year report of the Flood Technical Assistance Project. USDI Fish and Wildlife Service, Lacey, Washington.

Pickard, A., A. Grover, and F. Hall. 1982. An Evaluation of predator composition at three locations on the Sacramento River. Interagency Ecological Study Program for the Sacramento-San Joaquin Estuary. Technical Report No. 2.

Platts, W.S., W.F. Megahan, and G.W. Minshall. 1979. Methods for evaluating stream, riparian, and biotic conditions. USDA General Technical Report INT-138. Ogden, Utah.

Rasmussen, B. 1967. The effect of underwater explosions on marine life. Bergen, Norway.

Reynolds, F.L., T.J. Mills, R. Benthin, and A. Low. 1993. Restoring Central Valley streams: a plan for action. California Department of Fish and Game, Inland Fisheries Division, Sacramento.

Rich, A.A. 1997. Testimony of Alice A, Rich Ph.D. regarding water rights applications for the Delta Wetlands Project, proposed by Delta Wetlands Properties for Water Storage on Webb Tract, Bacon Island, Bouldin Island, and Holland Tract in Contra Costa and San Joaquin Counties. July 1997. California Department of Fish and Game Exhibit DFG-7.

Submitted to State Water Resources Control Board.

Robison, G.E., and Beschta, R.L. 1990. Identifying trees in riparian areas that can provide coarse woody debris to streams. U.S. Forest Service 36:790-801.

Shapovalov, L., and A.C. Taft. 1954. The life histories of the steelhead rainbow trout (*Salmo gairdneri gairdneri*) and silver salmon (*Oncorhynchus kisutch*) with special reference to Waddell Creek, California, and recommendations regarding their management. California Department of Fish and Game, Fish Bulletin 98.

Sigler, J.W., T.C. Bjornn, and F.H. Everest. 1984. Effects of chronic turbidity on density and growth of steelhead and coho salmon. Transactions of the American Fisheries Society 113:142-150.

Slater, D.W. 1963. Winter-run Chinook salmon in the Sacramento River, California with notes on water temperature requirements at spawning. Special Science Report No. 461.

Snider, B., and R.G. Titus. 2000. Timing, composition, and abundance of juvenile anadromous salmonid emigration in the Sacramento River near Knights Landing, October 1996-September 1997. California Department of Fish and Game, Habitat Conservation Division, Stream Evaluation Program Technical Report No. 00-04.

Sommer, D.D. McEwan, and R. Brown. 2001. Factors affecting Chinook spawning in the lower Feather River. Contributions to the biology of Central Valley salmonids. R. Brown editor, California Department of Fish and Game Fish Bulletin No. 179.

Stevens, D.E. 1961. Food habits of striped bass, *Roccus saxitilis* (Walbaum), in the Rio Vista area of the Sacramento River. Master's Thesis, University of California, Berkeley.

Tiffan, K.F., R.D. Garland, and D.W. Rondorf. 2002. Quantifying flow dependant changes in sub-yearling fall-run Chinook salmon habitat using two dimensional spatially explicit modelling. North American Journal of Fisheries Management. 22:713-726.

Tillman, T.L., G.W. Edwards, and K.A.F. Urquhart. 1996. Adult salmon migration during the various operational phases of Suisun Marsh Salinity Control Gates in Montezuma Slough: August-October 1993. Agreement to Department of Water Resources, Ecological Services Office by California Department of Fish and Game, Bay-Delta and Special Water Projects Division.

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Sacramento District. 2004. Standard Assessment Methodology for the Sacramento River Bank Protection Project, Final Review Draft. Prepared by Stillwater Sciences and Dean Ryan Consultants, Sacramento, California. Contract DACW05-99-D-0006. Task Order 0017. May 25, 2004.

U.S. Department of Interior. 1999. Final Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement for the Central Valley Project Improvement Act. October 1999. Technical Appendix, 10 volumes.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 1992. Shaded riverine aquatic cover of the Sacramento River system: Classification as resource category 1 under the FWS mitigation policy. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Sacramento Field Office, Sacramento, California.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 1999. Effects of temperature on early-life survival of Sacramento River fall- and winter-run Chinook salmon. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Final Report, January 1999.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 2000. Impacts of riprapping to ecosystem functioning, lower Sacramento River, California. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Sacramento Field Office, Sacramento, California. Prepared for US Army Corps of Engineers, Sacramento District.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 2003. Abundance and Survival of Juvenile Chinook Salmon in the Sacramento-San Joaquin Estuary: 1999. Annual progress report Sacramento-San Joaquin Estuary.

Van Woert, W. 1958. Time pattern of migration of salmon and steelhead into the upper Sacramento River during the 1957-1958 season. Inland Fisheries Administrative Report 59-7.

Van Woert, W. 1964. Mill Creek counting station. Office memorandum to Eldon Hughes, May 25, 1964. California Deptartment of Fish and Game, Water Projects Branch, Contract Services Section.

Vogel, D.A. K.R. Marine, and J.G. Smith. 1988. Fish passage action program for Red Bluff Diversion Dam. Final Report, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Report No. FR1-FAO-88-19.

Vogel, D.A., and K.R. Marine. 1991. Guide to Upper Sacramento River Chinook salmon life history. Prepared for the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation, Central Valley Project.

Waples, R.S. 1991. Pacific Salmon, *Oncorhynchus spp.*, and the definition of "species" under the Endangered Species Act. Marine Fisheries Review 53:11-21.

Yoshiyama, R.M., E.R. Gerstung, F.W. Fisher, and P.B Moyle. 1996. Historical and present distribution of Chinook salmon in the Central Valley Drainage of California. *in*: Sierra Nevada Ecosystem Project, Final Report to Congress, volume III, Assessments, Commissioned Reports, and Background Information. University of California, Davis, Centers for Water and Wildland Resources, 1996.

Yoshiyama, R.M, F.W. Fisher, and P.B. Moyle. 1998. Historical abundance and decline of Chinook salmon in the Central Valley region of California. North American Journal of Fisheries Management 18:487-521.

Enclosure 2

MAGNUSON-STEVENS FISHERY CONSERVATION AND MANAGEMENT ACT

ESSENTIAL FISH HABITAT CONSERVATION RECOMMENDATIONS

Agency:	United States Bureau of Reclamation Mid-Pacific Region
Activity:	Sutter Mutual Water Company Tisdale Pumping Plant Positive Barrier Fish Screen Project
Consultation Conducted By:	Southwest Region, National Marine Fisheries Service

I. IDENTIFICATION OF ESSENTIAL FISH HABITAT

This document represents the National Marine Fisheries Service's (NOAA Fisheries) Essential Fish Habitat (EFH) consultation based on our review of information provided by the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation) on the proposed Sutter Mutual Water Company Tisdale Fish Screen Project (Tisdale Fish Screen Project), located in Sutter County, California, near river mile (RM) 118. The Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation Act (MSA) as amended (U.S.C 180 et seq.) requires that EFH be identified and described in Federal fishery management plans (FMPs). Federal action agencies must consult with NOAA Fisheries on activities which they fund, permit, or carry out that may adversely affect EFH. NOAA Fisheries is required to provide EFH conservation and enhancement recommendations to the Federal action agencies. The geographic extent of freshwater EFH for Pacific salmon in the Sacramento River includes waters currently or historically accessible to salmon within hydrologic units 18020109 (lower Sacramento River) and 18020112 (upper Sacramento River to Clear Creek).

EFH is defined as those waters and substrate necessary to fish for spawning, breeding, feeding, or growth to maturity. For the purpose of interpreting the definition of essential fish habitat, "waters" includes aquatic areas and their associated physical, chemical, and biological properties that are used by fish, and may include areas historically used by fish where appropriate; "substrate" includes sediment, hard bottom, structures underlying the waters, and associated biological communities; "necessary" means habitat required to support a sustainable fishery and a healthy ecosystem; and "spawning, breeding, feeding, or growth to maturity" covers all habitat types used by a species throughout its life cycle.

The biological and conference opinion for Tisdale Fish Screen Project addresses Chinook salmon listed under the both the Endangered Species Act (ESA) and the MSA that potentially will be affected by the proposed action. These salmon include Sacramento River winter-run Chinook salmon (*Oncorhynchus tshawytscha*), and Central Valley spring-run Chinook salmon (*O. tshawytscha)*. This EFH consultation will concentrate on Central Valley fall-/late fall-run

Chinook salmon (*O. tshawytscha*) because they are covered under the MSA but not listed under the ESA.

Historically, Central Valley fall-run Chinook salmon generally spawned in the Central Valley and lower-foothill reaches up to an elevation of approximately 1,000 feet. Much of the historical fall-run spawning habitat was located below existing dam sites and the run therefore was not as severely affected by water projects as other runs in the Central Valley.

Although fall-run Chinook salmon abundance is relatively high, several factors continue to affect habitat conditions in the Sacramento River, including loss of fish to unscreened agricultural diversions, predation by warm-water fish species, lack of rearing habitat, regulated river flows, high water temperatures, and reversed flows in the Delta that draw juveniles into State and Federal water project pumps.

A. Life History and Habitat Requirements

Central Valley fall-run Chinook salmon enter the Sacramento River from July through December, and late fall-run enter between October and March. Fall-run Chinook salmon generally spawn from October through December, and late fall-run fish spawn from January to April. The physical characteristics of Chinook salmon spawning beds vary considerably. Chinook salmon will spawn in water that ranges from a few centimeters to several meters deep provided that the there is suitable sub-gravel flow (Healey 1991). Spawning typically occurs in gravel beds that are located in marginally swift riffles, runs and pool tails with water depths exceeding one foot and velocities ranging from one to 3.5 feet per second. Preferred spawning substrate is clean loose gravel ranging from one to four inches in diameter with less that 5 percent fines (Reiser and Bjornn 1979).

Fall-run Chinook salmon eggs incubate between October and March, and juvenile rearing and smolt emigration occur from January through June (Reynolds *et al.* 1993). Shortly after emergence, most fry disperse downstream towards the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta and estuary while finding refuge in shallow waters with bank cover formed by tree roots, logs, and submerged or overhead vegetation (Kjelson *et al.* 1982). These juveniles feed and grow from January through mid-May, and emigrate to the Delta and estuary from mid-March through mid-June (Lister and Genoe 1970). As they grow, the juveniles associate with coarser substrates along the stream margin or farther from shore (Healey 1991). Smolts generally spend a very short time in the Delta and estuary before entry into the ocean.

II. PROPOSED ACTION

The Bureau of Reclamation, along with the Sutter Mutual Water Company propose to construct and operate the Tisdale Fish Screen Project, along the east bank of the Sacramento River, near river mile (RM) 118. The proposed action will construct an approximately 280-foot long and 50-

foot high positive-barrier fish screen at an existing water diversion. The screen will be comprised of 16 panels that are 182 square feet each. The total effective fish screen area will be 2,909 square feet, and will provide a 960 cfs pumping capacity while meeting NOAA Fisheries and California Department of Fish and Game (DFG) anadromous fish screening criteria at all projected river elevations. The proposed action includes construction, operations and maintenance, conservation measures, and monitoring. The proposed action is described in the *Description of the Proposed Action* section of the preceding biological and conference opinion (Enclosure 1).

III. EFFECTS OF THE PROJECT ACTION

The effects of the proposed action on Pacific Coast salmon EFH would be similar to those discussed in the *Effects of the Proposed Action* section of the preceding biological and conference opinion (Enclosure 1) for endangered Sacramento River winter-run Chinook salmon, threatened Central Valley spring-run Chinook salmon, and threatened Central Valley steelhead. A summary of the effects of the proposed action on Central Valley fall-/late fall-run Chinook salmon are discussed below.

Adverse effects to Chinook salmon habitat will result from construction-related impacts, operations and maintenance impacts, and long-term impacts related to the extensive modification and loss of aquatic and riparian habitat at the project site. Primary construction-related impacts include turbidity and suspended sediment created during cofferdam installation and dredging. Habitat impacts include the permanent loss of approximately 460 linear feet, and 0.5 acres of existing nearshore aquatic habitat along the Sacramento River levee. The placement of additional riprap along the base of the screen and upstream and downstream from the screen would impact the shoreline of the Sacramento River for a distance of approximately 610 feet. These actions will cause an immediate reduction in habitat availability, and nearshore habitat complexity and suitability.

In-channel construction activities such as dredging and cofferdam installation will cause temporary increases in suspended sediment and turbidity. Turbidity will be minimized by implementing the proposed conservation measures such as implementation of BMPs and adherence to Regional Board water quality standards. Fuel spills or use of toxic compounds during project construction could release toxic contaminants into the Sacramento River and could injure or kill salmon and steelhead. Adherence to BMPs that dictate the use, containment, and cleanup of contaminants will minimize the risk of introducing such products to the waterway because the prevention and contingency measures will require frequent equipment checks to prevent leaks, will keep stockpiled materials away from the water, and will require that absorbent booms are kept on-site to prevent petroleum products from entering the river in the event of a spill or leak.

Operations and maintenance actions will be conducted annually to ensure the performance of the fish screen. Most actions are expected to occur during the summer when anadromous fish are not expected to be present, or behind the fish screen structure, where impacts will not extend into areas of occupied fish habitat.

Overall, NOAA Fisheries expects that the loss and modification of nearshore aquatic habitat in the action area may adversely affect the EFH of Chinook salmon through the reduction of habitat complexity necessary for growth, refugia, and survival. However, it is expected that adverse effects will be small, and reduced over time with the successful implementation of the project's conservation measures.

IV. CONCLUSION

Upon review of the effects of Tisdale Fish Screen Project, NOAA Fisheries believes that the project will result in adverse effects to the EFH of Pacific salmon protected under the MSA.

V. EFH CONSERVATION RECOMMENDATIONS

Considering that the habitat requirements of fall-run within the action area are similar to the federally-listed species addressed in the preceding biological and conference opinion (Enclosure 1), NOAA Fisheries recommends that Terms and Condition 2a, 2b, 3a, and 3b as well as all the Conservation Recommendations in the preceding biological and conference opinion prepared for the Sacramento River winter-run Chinook salmon, Central Valley spring-run Chinook salmon, and Central Valley steelhead ESUs be adopted as EFH Conservation Recommendations.

Section 305(b)4(B) of the MSA requires Reclamation to provide NOAA Fisheries with a detailed written response within 30 days, and 10 days in advance of any action, to the EFH conservation recommendations, including a description of measures adopted by Reclamation for avoiding, minimizing, or mitigating the impact of the project on EFH (50 CFR ' 600.920[j]). In the case of a response that is inconsistent with our recommendations, Reclamation must explain its reasons for not following the recommendations, including the scientific justification for any disagreements with NOAA Fisheries over the anticipated effects of the proposed action and the measures needed to avoid, minimize, or mitigate such effects.

VI. LITERATURE CITED

Healey, M.C. 1991. Life history of chinook salmon. *in*: C. Groot and L. Margolis: Pacific Salmon Life Histories. University of British Columbia Press.

Kjelson, M.A., P.F. Raquel, and F.W. Fisher. 1982. Life history of fall-run juvenile chinook salmon, *Oncorhynchus tshawytscha*, in the Sacramento-San Joaquin estuary, California, pages 393-411 *in*: V.S. Kennedy (editor). Estuarine comparisons. Academic Press, New York, New York.

Lister, D.B. and H.S. Genoe. 1970. Stream habitat utilization by cohabiting underyearlings of (*Oncorhynchus tshawytscha*) and coho (*O. kisutch*) salmon in the Big Qualicum River, British Columbia. Journal of the Fishery Resources Board of Canada 27:1215-1224.

Reiser, D.W., and T.C. Bjornn. 1979. Influence of forest and rangeland management on anadromous fish habitat in western North America: Habitat requirements of anadromous salmonids. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service General Technical Report PNW-96. Pacific Northwest Forest and Range Experimental Station, Portland, Oregon. 54 pages.

Reynolds, F.L., T.J. Mills, R. Benthin, and A. Low. 1993. Restoring Central Valley Streams: A Plan for Action. California Department of Fish and Game. Inland Fisheries Division.